DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 206 844 CE 029 929

AUTHOR	Foat, Classie M.
TITLE	Study of the Career Intern Program. Task D: Final Report, Volume 2. Comparisons of the CIP with Other Similar Youth Programs.
INSTITUTION	RMC Research Corp., Mountain View, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	RMC-UR-475
PUB DATE	May 81
CONTRACT	400-78-0021
NOTE	121p.; For related documents see CE 029 925-930 and TM 810 654.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Attendance; *Career Education; Case Studies; Comparative Analysis; Counseling Services; Dropout Prevention; Dropout Programs; *Dropouts; *Economically Disadvantaged; Educational Objectives; Education Work Relationship; Enrollment; Experiential Learning; *Field Experience Programs; Graduation; *High School Students; Job Placement; Nontraditional Education; Outcomes of Education; Potential Dropouts; Program Costs; Program Descriptions; *Program Effectiveness; Program Implementation; School Holding Power; Secondary Education; Success; Youth Programs

ABSTRACT

A study compared the Career Intern Program (CIP) with five other alternative youth programs. (The CIP is an alternative high school designed to enable disadvantaged dropouts or potential dropouts to earn regular high school diplomas, to prepare them for meaningful employment or postsecondary education, and to facilitate their transition from school to work by providing instruction, counseling, hands-on career exposure, diagnosis/assessment, and climate.) The programs compared to CIP were the Alternative Learning Center of Westover, West Virginia; the Harbor City Learning Experience-Based Career Education Program of Baltimore, Maryland; the Independence High School of Newark, New Jersey; the Kensington-Edison Youth Program of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and the Urban League Street Academy of New Orleans, Louisiana. Examined in the study were the following effectiveness measures: enrollment, attendance, retention, graduation, and placement. Enrollments were linked to reputation in the community, accessible location, and scheduling. While all programs had difficulty maintaining high attendance levels and retaining students, schools with support services had better attendance. Programs offering general equivalency degrees had more graduates than schools granting regular diplomas. Finally, CIP had fewer job placements than did comparable institutions. (Related reports evaluating various aspects of CIP are available separately through ERIC--see note.) (MN)

ED206844
CE 029 929

RMC Report No. UR 475

STUDY OF THE CAREER INTERN PROGRAM

Task D Final Report
Volume 2

Comparisons of the CIP with Other Similar Youth Programs

Classie M. Foat

May 1981

Prepared for the
National Institute of Education

RMC Research Corporation
Mountain View, California

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to Contract No. 400-78-0021 with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgement in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Institute position or policy, and no official endorsement by the sponsor should be inferred.

Contents

List of Tables iv

Preface v

Acknowledgements vii

Executive Summary ix

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. SELECTING PROJECTS SIMILAR TO THE CIP 5

III. ANALYSIS OF THE CIP AND THE FIVE ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS . . 11
- Comparison 1: Alternative Learning Center 16
- Comparison 2: Harbor City Learning Program 29
- Comparison 3: Independence High School 43
- Comparison 4: Kensington-Edison Youth Program 57
- Comparison 5: Urban League Street Academy 69

IV. ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF THE CIP 85

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 93

APPENDIX A 97

APPENDIX B 103

REFERENCES 115

4

List of Tables

Page

Table 1 Characteristics of the CIP and Comparison Programs 3

Table 2 Summary of Reasons Projects Were Rejected 9

PREFACE

The Career Intern Program (CIP) is an alternative high school for low-income youth between the ages of 16 and 21 who have dropped out of their regular high school or who are at serious risk of doing so. Developed in Philadelphia in 1972 by the Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America, Inc. (OIC/A), the project achieved notable success in helping youth graduate from secondary school and in smoothing their transition from school to work, to further technical training, or to post-secondary education.

This report presents the findings of one part of RMC Research Corporation's Study of the Career Intern Program--the comparison of the CIP with other similar alternative approaches. The contract for this study was awarded to RMC by the National Institute of Education (NIE) in April, 1978, pursuant to an Interagency Agreement between NIE and the Department of Labor (DOL). The major purpose of the evaluation was to find out if the same beneficial outcomes that had been observed in the Philadelphia prototype could be achieved in four new sites. DOL funded the dissemination effort and, through the Interagency Agreement, arranged to have NIE monitor both the dissemination itself and the evaluation of the program at the four new sites. The total evaluation comprises the comparison study just mentioned and three other tasks: an assessment of the CIP's implementation in the four sites; an assessment of the effects of the program on students; and an analysis of the relationships between the CIP's operations and its impact on youths.

The comparison of the CIP with other approaches is also discussed in two separate Task D volumes. Volume I describes the comparison of the CIP with other programs emphasizing issues related to implementation. The programs described in that volume were started at the same time as the CIP, but offered different services. Thus, while it was not feasible to conduct comparisons emphasizing effectiveness issues, comparisons in terms of implementation were considered appropriate. The present volume--Volume II--encompasses comparisons of the CIP with other alternative schools having similar program components. The comparisons emphasize issues related to five outcomes that reflect, at least to some extent, the effectiveness of the program: attendance, enrollment, retention, graduation, and placement. The study explores specific questions such as: "What are the advantages and disadvantages of a community-based organization over a local education agency (LEA), prime sponsor, a private contractor, or other agency in administering a program like the CIP?" and, "What are the features of alternative programs for youth that are related to their success in attracting youth, in improving their school attendance, in helping them to graduate, and in enhancing their employability?"

Having stated the focus of this report, it is now necessary to clarify its intentions and limitations. It is important, first, to point out that the question of how the CIP compares in effectiveness with other approaches has changed from what was originally called for in RFP No. NIE-R-78-0004. The RFP specified that "projects undergoing comparable evaluations" be identified. The search, however, although extensive, failed to identify any projects with evaluations that employed designs similar to that used with the CIP. Thus, the comparisons that are made in this report employ such criteria as success in increasing high school retention, decreasing absenteeism, facilitating graduation, and placing youth in jobs, college, or skills-training programs. Since the data reported by the five comparison sites and the CIP are not exactly comparable, the findings must be interpreted with extreme caution. Not only do the evaluation designs differ, but there are major differences in how indices such as attendance and attrition are defined and enumerated.

An additional, even more important problem is that the comparison projects were substantially more stable and mature than the CIP. Two projects had been in existence for seven years. Comparing them to the three-year-old CIP is problematic at best.

Finally, there does not appear to be any adequate way, when comparing the CIP to the other projects, to take into account differences in project effects that may be related to the demonstration nature of the CIP. Any inferences made about the relative strengths or weaknesses of the CIP's components must be tempered by the fact that the CIP replications were undertaken as a field-test study of implementation; the comparison sites were established programs, not experiments.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This Task D Volume 2 Report was prepared for the National Institute of Education under contract number 400-78-0021. Guidance was provided by Charles Stalford, Howard Lesnick, and Daniel Antonoplos. Dr. Howard Lesnick also assisted with the search for career education programs. I thank these persons for their help.

The study's Advisory Panel also provided guidance particularly in orienting the study toward a more defined scope. I am grateful to Paul Benewitz, David Hampson, Addison Hobbes, Sidney Marland, William Mirengoff, Beatrice Reubens, Rodney Riffel, and Joseph Yaeger.

The work reported herein would not have been possible without the continued cooperation and assistance of the project directors and staff of the five comparison programs. I am grateful to Fred Gladish of the Alternative Learning Center, Ray Baines, Ernest Reed, and Maurice Robinson of the Harbor City Learning Experience-Based Career Education Program, Phil Yourish of Independence High School, Frank Gentile, James Weiss, and Betsy Vengis of the Kensington-Edison Youth Program, and Gail Glapion and Dorothy Sockwell of the Urban League Street Academy.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge my RMC colleagues for their help. I am grateful to Bess Thrope who assisted with the data analyses and provided very useful comments on the report. Appreciation is expressed to G. Kasten Tallmadge for his very helpful editing comments. Sincere appreciation is also expressed to Terri Jaber for her most pleasant attitude in typing the manuscript.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this second volume of the Task D Final Report is to present comparisons of the Career Intern Program (CIP) with five other quite similar alternative programs. (Volume 1 presents the comparisons of the CIP with other YEDPA programs in terms of implementation issues. Volume 3 discusses cost issues.) As an alternative high school program for dropout and potential dropouts, the CIP was awarded exemplary status in 1977 by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel of the National Institute of Education and the U.S. Office of Education. It was tried out in four new sites between December 1977 and October 1980 under a Department of Labor and National Institute of Education Interagency Agreement. RMC evaluated the replication effort at all four sites. Four tasks were undertaken: Task A assessed the implementation of the program; Task B assessed student outcomes; Task C examined causal linkages between components of the treatment and student outcomes; and Task D compared the CIP with other similar alternative programs.

This portion of the comparison study entailed a nine-month search for programs having objectives similar to those of the CIP, serving similar target groups, and having similar treatment characteristics. Thus, programs that (a) served primarily 16 to 21 year old dropouts and potential dropouts, (b) sought to graduate these youth (either by preparing them for a regular high school diploma or a GED), and (c) attempted to smooth the transition from school to work, were considered. In addition, the candidate programs had to provide instruction in basic academic skills, have a career-education focus, and provide some form of counseling. Every attempt was made to select alternative programs having a striking resemblance to the CIP.

The search for CIP-like programs led to a review of over 500 programs, 124 of which appeared to be within the study's scope. Careful examination of the documentation of the 124 programs resulted in the identification of only five alternative schools which had a striking resemblance to the CIP and could provide sufficient data regarding treatment and outcomes to justify comparisons. These five alternative schools were:

- The Alternative Learning Center of Westover, West Virginia;
- The Harbor City Learning Experience-Based Career Education Program of Baltimore, Maryland;
- The Independence High School of Newark, New Jersey;
- The Kensington-Edison Youth Program of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and
- The Urban League Street Academy of New Orleans, Louisiana.

While these five programs closely resembled the CIP, features such as operating under the jurisdiction of the LEA, offering stipends or paid work experience, and providing specific skills training and child care services clearly distinguished them from the CIP. Also, four of the programs had been in existence much longer than the CIP (two had existed for as long as seven years).

The comparisons of the CIP with the selected alternative programs focused on five effectiveness measures: enrollment, attendance, retention, graduation, and placement. Unfortunately, the programs used different formulae for calculating attendance and retention rates, and employed different definitions of several outcome variables. Consequently, feature-by-feature and outcome-by-outcome contrasts were usually not possible. Instead, a case study approach was adopted wherein each program's processes and treatments were described. Differences between them and the CIP were highlighted and the outcomes were compared in terms of contrasting factors thought to be related to stated or implied outcomes. Some tentative inferences were drawn about the relative merits of various program features. However, the inferred causal linkages between the treatment and the outcomes could not be unambiguously drawn even where the data appeared to be quite persuasive.

In terms of achieving enrollment objectives, the most relevant factors appeared to be a good reputation in the community, an intake schedule that was coordinated with the regular high school, a non-threatening working relationship with the LEA, a catchment area with a large enough pool of potential program enrollees, a location in which there were not many other programs competing for the same students, and reasonably stable funding. The CIP was at some disadvantage during its first years' operation in that it did not have enough time to establish itself in the community. It also experienced the presence of competing alternative programs and fell under the threat of funding termination on more than one occasion. However, once it became stable, it was able to meet its enrollment objective.

The CIP and all five comparison programs had difficulty maintaining high attendance levels. However, projects that provided incentives such as child care, paid work, and car fare had more success in getting students to attend. The findings also point clearly to the fact that school attendance is improved by firm attendance policies. A caring staff and daily follow-up of absent students are two further factors that appear helpful in maintaining acceptable attendance levels. Attendance is also improved when strong connections are made betweeen graduation and attendance and when unexcused absences are grounds for termination.

The CIP and the comparison programs also experienced substantial difficulty in retaining students. Programs which served primarily dropouts were at a particular disadvantage compared to programs serving a majority of potential dropouts. The data also indicated that, while strict attendance policies increased attendance, they decreased retention. Finally, programs offering part-time work had less success in retaining students because the students often were offered (and accepted) full-time employment.

The graduation findings indicated that programs offering GEDs had more success graduating students than the CIP and other programs offering regular high school diplomas. The main factor accounting for this difference appeared to be the accelerated nature of GED programs. These programs were also more flexible in that they did not have to conform to LEA curriculum requirements.

In regard to the fifth and final outcome, placement, the findings indicated that the CIP had an advantage over most of the comparison programs in placing graduates in college, but in terms of job placements, the comparison programs generally had the advantage. This finding strongly reflects the emphasis of the CIP on encouraging participants to continue their education, rather than directly entering employment. There was no difference between GED and high school diploma programs in terms of job placements. The kinds of linkages that are made with the college and business community, the job or college orientation of the programs, and the availability of employment in the area are factors that are related to the differences in college and job placements.

In summary, the findings of the present study revealed a number of features that appear related to improved enrollment, attendance, and retention, and to a program's ability to graduate and place students in college, jobs, or on-the-job training programs. The implementation difficulties experienced by the CIP placed it at a disadvantage on two of these outcomes--attendance and enrollment. In regard to retaining students, no striking advantage or disadvantages were noted for the CIP although paid work experience, lax attendance policies, and a positive caring staff enhanced retention. The GED programs had more success graduating youths than did programs offering a regular high school diploma. Finally, the CIP had some advantage over other programs in placing students in college.

It is RMC's general conclusion that had the CIP been a fully functioning program throughout the three-year demonstration period, it would have accomplished and perhaps even surpassed its objectives on the five outcome measures. As it was, however, persistent difficulties such as interrupted funding, lack of sufficient time to establish its reputation in the community, the presence of competing alternative programs, a lack of time to set up, poorly coordinated intake schedules, and a lack of time to follow up on absent students detracted from its performance in each of the five effectiveness areas.

I. INTRODUCTION

Study Purpose

The purpose of this report is to compare the CIP with other quite similar alternative high school projects in terms of their effectiveness. The central question addressed is, "How does the CIP approach compare in effectiveness, as well as feasibility and other factors important for policy, with other approaches designed to help youths who have dropped out or who are at risk of dropping out of school?" The intent of the comparison is to provide information about the relative advantages and disadvantages of alternative intervention strategies and different systems for delivering programs designed to increase the "employability" of youths.

Overview of Comparison Programs

An initial search of career and vocational education programs, either operating as separate alternative schools or as part of regular school programs, produced some 500 projects. Only 124 of these 500 projects were alternative schools. Lack of program comparability in terms of scope, objectives, and program treatment, as well as the lack of descriptive and evaluative data, however, ultimately reduced this pool to only five alternative school projects.

The five comparison projects are strikingly similar to the CIP. Like the CIP, they serve dropouts and/or potential dropouts. All operate as autonomous alternative schools and are located in buildings that do not resemble regular high schools. Their educational programs and teaching methods emphasize such features as small classes and individualized instruction and, like the CIP, are different from those found in the traditional school. Finally, all the projects include an academic component, a career focus, and counseling services. The major distinguishing features of the projects are listed below.

- Only one of the projects is a community-based program, like the CIP. Three others operate under the jurisdiction of the LEA. The fifth project is a private school operating independently of the LEA.

- Three of the sites offer a high school diploma, as does the CIP. The other two programs prepare students for the high school equivalency examination (GED).

- Four of the projects offer either stipends or paid work experience, unlike the CIP which offers neither.

- Two of the projects provide specific skills training.

- Two of the projects provide child care services for participating students, unlike the CIP.

- One project has been operating for three years, two for four years, and the other two for seven and eight years respectively.

These and other characteristics of the CIP and the five comparison programs are summarized in Table 1.

Specific Study Questions

The common and distinguishing elements of the five comparison programs and the CIP make it possible to address a number of questions relevant to policy makers and policy analysts interested in enhancing the employability of youths. Given that all the projects operate as autonomous alternative schools, for example, but are administered by different organizations, some information can be provided about the relative effectiveness of these different agencies in providing services designed to increase youth employability. A specific question to be addressed is: What are the advantages and disadvantages of a community-based organization over a local education agency, prime sponsor, a private contractor, or other agency administering a program like the CIP? Additionally, given that some programs make provisions for stipends or paid work for youths, day care services, and skills training, questions can be asked as to whether or not these program features are related to improved school attendance, improved retention rate, increased job placement, or an increase in the number of graduates. It must be remembered, however, that while differences in project features are readily apparent, establishing causal linkages between features and outcomes is more difficult.

General Approach

In drawing the comparisons, RMC avoided feature-by-feature and outcome-by-outcome contrasts. Rather, a case study approach was used wherein each project's components were described in terms of the processes used and the treatments provided. Subsequent discussion then pointed out differences between those processes and treatments and those of the CIP.

The effectiveness of each project was analyzed in terms of the extent to which it achieved stated or implied objectives. The program factors thought to be related to the program's outcomes were analyzed using information gleaned from in-depth interviews with directors and project staff and various evaluative and descriptive documents. The inferred causal linkages drawn were in terms of their nature and effectiveness compared to those thought to be important to the CIP's success. From this analysis it was possible to make some tentative statements about the relative merits of the CIP in comparison to the other alternative approaches.

Table 1
Characteristics of the CIP and Comparison Programs

Program Name/ Location	No. Years Operation	Approximate[a] No. Participants	Type of Youth School		Type of High School Diploma	Funding Source	Sponsoring Agency	Other Distinguishing Features
			% Dropouts	% Potential Dropouts				
Alternative Learning Center (ALC) Westover, WV	4	78	50	50	GED Diploma	LEA	Monongalia County Schools	Paid work experience; specific skills training
Career Intern Program Brooklyn, Detroit, Poughkeepsie, Seattle	2	100-200/ site	50	50	Regular	DOL/ NIE	OIC/A	
Harbor City Learning Experience-Based Career Education Program (EBCE) Baltimore, MD	3	97	90	10	Regular and GED Preparation	CETA; LEA	Mayor's Off. of Manpower Resources; LEA	Student stipends, child care center
Independence High School (IHS) Newark, NJ	8	110	50	50	Regular	DOL, YEDPA State Title XX	Youthwork, Inc.	Paid work experience
Kensington-Edison Youth Program (KEY) Philadelphia, PA	4	80	--	100	Regular	LEA	Philadelphia Sc. Dist.	Specific skills training
Urban League Street Academy (ULSA) New Orleans, LA	7	90	100	--	GED Preparation	Title IV ESEA; U.S. Office of Career Ed.	Urban League	Stipends; child care center

[a] Average number of enrollees over a one-year period.

Report Organization

The remainder of this report is divided into four chapters. Chapter II describes the search for candidate projects. Chapter III presents a summary of CIP outcomes in the areas of enrollment, attendance, retention, graduation, and placement. It also contains case-study comparisons of the CIP with each of the five comparison projects. The case-study descriptions include outcome information and, where it seemed reasonable to draw them, inferences about relationships between treatment components and program outcomes. These inferred relationships, in turn, are compared and contrasted with those observed in the CIP. An analysis of the results across the six programs and the inferences drawn from the comparisons are presented in the fourth chapter, followed by the fifth and final chapter which presents the summary and conclusions.

II. SELECTING PROJECTS SIMILAR TO THE CIP

The Task D search for projects similar in scope to the CIP was undertaken on a wide scale. Nominations were sought from many sources, and several literature reviews were also undertaken. This process was ongoing from September, 1978 until May, 1979, when the acceptance of nominations had to be cut off.

Nomination Sources

Because the CIP is a career education project, the primary focus of the search was on Federal, State, and local career education projects, but adult and vocational education projects were not excluded from the study's scope. Although clear and distinct differences among these different kinds of programs do exist, they all serve complementary purposes in offering basic skills training and instruction pertinent to the world of work. The search was limited to projects that served 16- to 21-year-old youth.

Four major sources of nominations were used to identify projects. The first major source was the literature on career and vocational education. A wide variety of publications were obtained from the Office of Career Education, NIE, and other sources. Included among these publications were: Catalog of NIE Education Products (1975), Catalog of Federal Youth Programs (1976), Report on Commissioner's National Conference on Career Education (1976), Monographs on Career Education: A Review of Career Education Evaluation Studies (1976), Program Plan for Fiscal Years 1977/1978 Education and Work (1977), Profiles of Career Education Projects (1978), and the National Directory of Experience-Based Career Education Programs (1978). A 1979 ERIC literature search on alternative school programs was also provided by the NIE Project Officer. Current issues of the Journal of Research and Development in Education and the Journal of Career Education were also reviewed.

A second major source of nominations were persons in Federal, State, and local agencies who either provided names of contact persons for nominations or names of specific projects. For example, members of the vocational education staff at the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education were contacted as were members of the National Advisory Council on Career Education, the Chief State School Officers, and the State Coordinators of Career Education.

Staff members of several research firms were the third major source of project nominations. Most profitable were visits made to the American Institutes for Research in Palo Alto to review specific project documentation of 257 projects that had been collected in conjunction with previous research contracts.

Finally, OIC/A and RMC staff members provided nominations from their own personal and professional contacts. Input from these persons led to names of contact persons at the National Urban League, Operation PUSH-EXCELL, and other community-based career-education programs.

Once contact persons were identified, they were sent a letter describing the study's purpose and requesting nominations of specific projects thought to be similar to the CIP. Nominated projects were sent similar letters that described the study's purpose and requested descriptive and evaluative documentation. Over 200 contact-person and project letters were sent. In some cases initial and follow-up telephone calls were made to expedite the gathering of information.

More than 75% of the persons contacted for project nominations responded to the requests for information and over 500 project descriptions were reviewed, most of which were not of alternative school programs and were immediately rejected as inappropriate for further consideration. In all, 124 alternative school projects were nominated as likely candidates for comparison to the CIP. Documentation was received from 77% of these projects.

Selection Criteria

All documentation was reviewed to determine if the projects were comparable to the CIP. Selecting projects with components similar to those of the CIP required that a well defined set of selection criteria be developed. These criteria were then used to provide an objective and consistent framework for reviewing each nominated project.

To develop the criteria, the overall objectives of the CIP, the youth population it serves, and the CIP's various treatment components (e.g., instruction, counseling, career development) and enabling components (e.g., personnel, relations with community) were used as guidelines. (For a detailed description of the CIP's treatment and enabling components, see Treadway, et al., 1979.) Consideration was also given to the quality of the descriptive and evaluative information that was available for each project. Ultimately, 16 criteria were finally developed for selecting projects to compare with the CIP.

Each project had to undergo a preliminary review--to see if the project was within the scope of the study--and a more refined review--to analyze the components that could be compared to the CIP. Therefore, each project was subject to preliminary and secondary sets of screening criteria.

Preliminary Screening Criteria

Thirteen preliminary screening criteria were developed and organized under the headings of objectives, demographic characteristics, treatment characteristics, size, and availability. With the exception of the last category, all of the preliminary screening criteria were designed to ensure that projects selected for comparative evaluations would indeed be similar to the CIP. The 13 criteria are listed below:

Objectives

- the project must have the goal of enabling students to complete high school and must offer a means of preparing students to earn a high school diploma, GED, or equivalent diploma;
- the project must have the goal of increasing high school retention;
- the project must have the goal of enhancing career planning and occupational knowledge among youth; and
- the project must have the goal of improving basic academic skills.

Demographic characteristics

- youth served must be actual or potential dropouts;
- youth served must come primarily from poverty areas with high youth unemployment;
- youth served must be 16-21 years of age; and
- youth served must have sufficient reading skills to ensure that they can comprehend instructional materials at the high school level.

Treatment characteristics

- the project must provide training in basic reading and math skills; and
- the project must provide for career planning and occupational knowledge activities.

Size

- the project must currently serve 50 or more youth.

Availability

- the project must have existing evaluative and descriptive documentation; and

- the project must be operating currently.

Projects that did not meet these 13 preliminary screening criteria were considered outside the study's scope and were rejected as candidates for comparison to the CIP.

Secondary Screening Criteria

Once candidates passed the preliminary screening criteria, three more-detailed criteria were used for the final selection. These criteria were primarily concerned with the adequacy of available information about the project and consideration could be given only to documented information that RMC was able to obtain prior to the writing of this report. The secondary screening criteria are listed below.

Project description

- The components of the project must be sufficiently well defined (either through written documentation or from site personnel) so that the procedures and activities of the project are clear.

Population served

- The evaluative and descriptive information reported must indicate which segments of the student population are represented in the findings (e.g., grade levels, age levels, in-school youth, out-of-school youth).

Outcome evaluation

- The project's outcomes must be compared with some stated or implicit criterion (e.g., expected attendance rates, placement goals). Carefully controlled experiments were not required.

All of these criteria had to be met before projects were selected for comparison with the CIP.

Screening Process

The screening of projects began by comparing the documented information about each nominated project against the 13 preliminary selection criteria to determine if the project was within the study's scope. In most cases information received from the projects was sufficiently detailed to allow such judgments. For those projects having inadequate information upon which to base a decision, follow-up telephone contacts were made. (The most common deficiency was a failure to describe the socioeconomic status of the participants.) Every effort was made to obtain the needed information and in only a few cases were site personnel unable to provide answers to our questions.

Appendix A lists the 124 projects that were examined along with the disposition of each after the screening process. Table 2 summarizes the frequency of the rejections by type. Seventy percent of the nominated projects were rejected because they did not (or because it could not be determined that they did) meet one or more of the preliminary screening criteria. Careful examination of the documentation of those projects that did meet the preliminary criteria revealed that, in all cases, the information available was not sufficient to meet the second set of criteria. Subsequent data collection efforts, however, resulted in each of the five projects that met the preliminary screening criteria passing the secondary criteria as well.

Table 2
Summary of Reasons Projects were Rejected

Reasons for Rejection	No. Projects	Percentage
Outside project scope	76	64
No response	29	24
Insufficient information	7	6
No longer exists	7	6
Total	119	100

The five projects identified as having met both sets of criteria are: (a) the Alternative Learning Center, Westover, West Virginia; (b) the Harbor City Learning Program (Experience-Based Career Education), Baltimore, Maryland, (c) Independence High School, Newark, New Jersey, (d) Kensington-Edison Youth Program, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and (e) the Urban League Street Academy, New Orleans, Louisiana. With exception for the Alternative Learning Center, these programs were visited by the author. All were also contacted by telephone to gather additional in-depth information about their program treatment and their evaluations.

III. ANALYSIS OF THE CIP AND THE FIVE ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS

This chapter summarizes the findings of RMC's comparison of the CIP with the five alternative schools identified as comparable to it. The five projects are:

- Alternative Learning Center (ALC), Westover, West Virginia
- Harbor City Learning Program: Experience-Based Career Education (EBCE), Baltimore, Maryland
- Independence High School (IHS), Newark, New Jersey
- Kensington-Edison Youth Program (KEY), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
- Urban League Street Academy (ULSA), New Orleans, Louisiana

The chapter begins by summarizing RMC's findings regarding CIP outcomes in the areas of enrollment, attendance, retention, graduation, and placement. These five areas were selected because they provided the only basis upon which meaningful comparisons could be made between the CIP and the five similar projects that were identified.

Following the CIP outcome summary, case-study descriptions of the five comparison projects are presented. Each case-study description encompasses the 5 outcome categories listed above as well as 11 components of the programs' treatment. These components are instruction, career education, counseling, student assessment, program climate, personnel, recruitment, facilities, funds, relations with the LEA, and relations with the community. The discussion focuses on both the common and distinguishing features of each program and the CIP, particularly as the features are thought to be related to outcome differences between the two.

Data comparability was the most severely limiting factor in RMC's attempt to draw meaningful inferences from the comparisons that were made (see Appendix B). Differences in project features were readily apparent, but causal linkages could not be clearly established. Thus, inferences made in the discussions of the CIP and the five comparison projects must be viewed cautiously. Even where the data appear extremely persuasive, it must be remembered that apparently equivalent bits of information (such as attendance rates) are subject to computational and definitional differences of a sufficient magnitude to cast serious doubt on their interpretability. For example, attendance rates were sometimes calculated by dividing the number of attendees by the number of enrollees. At other times the number of attendees was divided by the number of _active_ participants. The ratio derived from these two procedures could be dramatically different.

Summary of the CIP Outcomes

Overall, the four CIP sites had some difficulty meeting enrollment quotas, maintaining attendance levels and retention rates, and graduating students. The factors thought to be related to why certain outcomes were or were not achieved by the sites are summarized below for each outcome. (Detailed descriptions of these factors can be found in Treadway et al., 1981.)

Enrollment

The original objective was to serve four cohorts totaling 1,200 students at the four CIP sites during the two-year demonstration period (1977-78 and 1978-79). This worked out to 75 students per cohort per site, assuming an even distribution of students across sites and cohorts. Recruiting for at least two of the cohorts was also expected to produce enough applicants to form randomly assigned control groups of roughly equivalent size. The sites were expected to enroll the first cohort by the end of January 1978, seven weeks after the signing of the subcontracts between OIC/A and the local OICs. (OIC/A had received its contract from NIE on 8 December 1977.) Enrolling the second, third, and fourth cohorts was to occur in June 1978, September 1978, and January 1979, respectively.

The initial low level of youth interest in the CIPs and other implementation problems in the sites led to a revised objective (in December 1978) of 90 treatment students (and 55 control-group members) for a combined third- and fourth-cohort group (by January 1979). Subsequently, a nine-month extension was negotiated. Its enrollment quota was 100 interns and 75 controls per site (except at one site where only 75 interns were to be enrolled to prevent overcrowding of the facility).

None of the four CIP sites was able to meet the enrollment quotas for the first or second cohorts. All four sites succeeded in meeting the 90-55 quota for the third cohort, however, and three of them met the fourth-cohort quota. Each site had its own unique set of recruiting difficulties, but some problems were shared by all of them. The most important factors (not necessarily in order of importance) seemingly related to the sites' ability to meet the enrollment quotas for the third and fourth cohorts were:

- Feeder schools became more cooperative as the details of their working relationships with the CIP were finally negotiated and understood.
- CIP-employed school coordinators became more proficient in dealing with feeder school personnel.

- Intake procedures were modified to reduce time delays between application and testing, and between testing and notification of acceptance/rejection.

- Recruiting activities were expanded to include a larger number of feeder schools.

- Recruiting activities and intake times were better coordinated with the regular school schedule than was the case with the first two cohorts.

- A broader range of recruiting strategies was employed and recruiters became more skillful.

- The reputations of the CIPs became established in their communities, thereby attracting skeptical youths who had previously chosen not to apply.

RMC feels that recruiting would have been substantially easier had such factors as uncertain funding, the shortness of the demonstration period, and the possibility that applicants might be assigned to control groups been less readily apparent to potential candidates. On the other hand, RMC's opinion is that the CIP's sponsorship by a community-based organization helped it to identify and attract a substantial number of youths who would not have applied for admission under different circumstances.

Attendance

The CIP's attendance objective for the regular school term was 70%. The 70% criterion was established by OIC/A on the basis of the achieved attendance of the CIP prototype during its 1976 evaluation (Gibboney Associates, 1977). Two sites attained this 70% criterion during the 1979-80 regular school year. Three sites showed expected patterns where summer school attendance was lower than attendance during the regular year. For all sites, consistent positive relationships were found between program functioning and attendance. That is, intern attendance increased when a site was operating smoothly and decreased when it was experiencing operational difficulties. At one site, for example, attendance dropped by 15% immediately after the resignation of an effective director.

Several factors appear to be related to the lower than expected attendance rates. First, in regard to the low summer school attendance, the primary reason appeared to be the youths' need for summer work. While it is not a CIP policy to locate jobs for youth, all four CIP sites did so, much to their benefit. In-school attendance was especially improved at one site where arrangements were made to provide on-site summer employment through the nearby CETA program. At the other three sites, some difficulty with summer attendance continued because of such factors as travel time to work and conflicting school and work schedules.

Another factor thought to be related to low attendance was the difficulty the sites experienced in attaining and/or maintaining the encouraging and supportive school atmosphere specified by the CIP model. Furthermore, the counselors' heavy workloads frequently kept them from making daily follow-up phone calls to the homes of absent students. This most often happened because the CIP counselors had to spend much more time than expected on recruitment activities. It is RMC's opinion that higher intern attendance would have prevailed at the sites had they been able to fully implement the daily follow-up aspect of the CIP.

CIP Retention

A 57% retention rate was reported for the prototype CIP by its evaluators (Gibboney, 1977, p. 116). Of the four replication sites, one exceeded this retention level with 65%. The retention rates reported by the other three sites were substantially lower (26%, 39%, and 41%).

A major factor thought to be related to low retention is the implementation difficulty experienced by the sites. To illustrate, in the site which surpassed the standard set by the prototype, staff turnover was lowest, leadership was most stable, and the project was able to maintain full operational status for a longer period than was the case at any of the other sites (Treadway et al., 1981). At the site with the lowest retention rate, exactly the opposite conditions prevailed.

Another factor thought to be related to retention is the termination policy in effect. All four sites had a policy of terminating interns after a specified number of days absent. They varied, however, in their enforcement of this policy. When the policy was strictly enforced, the termination rate increased. However, when termination for absences was enforced, attendance correspondingly increased.

Two final factors thought to be related to retention were the interns' needs for employment and family care. These two factors ranked second (13%) and third (8%) among 10 reasons for termination cited by the CIP administrative staff. The most frequently cited reason was attendance (29%), although that finding may be somewhat misleading since employment and family care needs may have been the underlying reasons for poor attendance.

CIP Graduation

To earn a high school diploma, CIP students must meet the course credit and attendance requirements of the LEA at which they are "officially" enrolled (the LEA that will issue their diploma). During the two-year demonstration, the four CIPs graduated 225 (20%) of the 1,141 youth who enrolled.

Two sites reported the number of students that could have graduated. This number was calculated on the bases of the number of credits needed for graduation and the number that could be earned per semester. At one of these sites, 76% of the possible graduates actually graduated. At the other site, the percentage was forty.

Several factors appear to be related to the finding that fewer interns graduated than could have. In some instances, the expected LEA approval of courses did not materialize. A second factor was that interns took longer than the minimum time to complete the program. Some took longer for such reasons as poor attendance, but a large number of others chose to remain in the program because they liked the caring and supportive atmosphere. Some problems were encountered in determining graduation requirements for individual students. These students then either took courses they did not need or failed to take others that they did need. Finally, some interns passed the entrance test, but were found, once enrolled, not to have the reading skills necessary to master CIP coursework.

Placement

Across all four CIPs, 189 (84%) of the 225 graduates were placed in college, jobs, OJT programs, or the military. Of the 189 graduates who were placed, 50% were in college. Twenty-eight percent were employed, 15% were enrolled in OJT programs, and 7% entered the military. Thirteen of the graduates were unemployed, 5 were pregnant, and 1 was deceased. The status of 18 others was unknown.

As a career-focused program, the CIP seeks to place graduates into post-secondary situations that lead to satisfying careers, not into jobs. That the CIP has no skills-training component reflects this orientation. On the basis of the figures above, RMC concludes that for the youth who did graduate, the CIP does appear to have enhanced their eventual entry into career-oriented positions. Certainly that can be said of the half of the graduates who entered college, and it is probably true for many of those who went into the military, OJT programs, and employment.

COMPARISON 1:

ALTERNATIVE LEARNING CENTER
Westover, West Virginia

Program Overview

The Alternative Learning Center (ALC) is an LEA-operated alternative high school for dropouts and potential dropouts between the ages of 14 and 17. The program's primary goals are to enable students to earn a GED or return to the high schools for a regular high school diploma, and to assist them in obtaining employment. The program provides basic academic skills instruction, counseling, skills training, and part-time work. It is divided into three areas: instructional, career education, and counseling. The program is an open-entry, open-exit program where a maximum of 35 students are served at any one time. (The average number of participants per year is 78.) New students may enter the program once each month on a first-come, first-served basis. Students attend program classes for half a day and either attend the skills training center or work the other half of the day. The program operates during the regular school year only.

The instructional program is individualized for each student, although some small-group activities occur. Students are taught reading, math, science, social studies, literature, and grammar. They work primarily with programmed text materials, although they also make use of textbooks, workbooks, and audio visual materials. Students are taught in an open-classroom setting where the student-to-staff ratio is seven to one and where students choose the subject areas in which they will work for the academic half of the day.

The career education component consists of part-time work or skills training, job preparation classes, and monthly career education seminars. It is designed to provide students with a variety of experiences in the world of work. Once students complete the job preparation program which consists of seven sessions in such topics as social security and labor laws, they may elect to be placed into part-time employment or into the county's vocational/technical center for the non-academic half of the day. Students work and receive on-the-job skills training in such occupations as welding, construction, food services, and child care. Most of the jobs are with the fast food and retail businesses.

The counseling program includes individual, personal, academic, and family counseling. Each student is initially scheduled for four counseling sessions where the counselor addresses the student's personal concerns including family, home, and school adjustment problems. Additional counseling sessions are largely scheduled at the discretion of the student, although the counselor schedules intermittent meetings to keep in touch with each student's progress.

The ALC 1978-79 and 1979-80 evaluations reported data supportive of the program's success in enrollment, retention, graduation, and placement objectives. Attendance data were not reported. The enrollment data showed that the program was able to operate at full capacity throughout the school year. It maintained an averge monthly enrollment of 35 students. Over the two-year period, 156 students were served. The termination data showed that the program was able to retain 83 (53%) of the 156 students enrolled. Also, over the two-year period, the ALC enabled 63 (40%) of the 156 students to earn GEDs. Of these, 47 (75%) were placed in full-time employment, the military, college, or an OJT program.

Analysis of ALC Components

The ALC is designed to help dropouts and potential dropouts earn a GED or regular high school diploma and obtain employment. One major difference between the CIP and the ALC is that the ALC is an LEA-operated program rather than a community-based program having a somewhat symbiotic relationship with the LEA. Another difference is that the ALC is primarily a GED program. It allows the return of students to the regular high school to earn a regular diploma, but very few students do so (3% in 1977-78). The ALC also operates on a half-day school and a half-day work session rather than a full school day, as the CIP. These and other features of the ALC distinguish it from the CIP, although both programs attempt to accomplish similar objectives. The features of the ALC are compared to those of the CIP in greater detail below.

Context

The ALC emerged in 1976 as an outgrowth of a proposal submitted to the Governor's Committee on Crime, Delinquency, and Correction, by the Monongalia County School System and the Monongalia County Court System. The aim of the program, as intended by its authors, was to provide an alternative for Severely School Alienated (S.S.A.) youths (youths having a high truancy rate) that would have a positive impact upon the county's high incidence of juvenile delinquency. For the first two years of operation, the ALC program was funded 90% by Federal monies and 5% each by State and local monies. It is currently (after four years operation) funded entirely by local (county school system) monies.

The ALC is located near the college town of Morgantown, WV. The project is housed in a new facility in Westover, a small mining town just a few miles outside of Morgantown. Like the CIP, the ALC is located in an area that is plagued by a high crime rate and a high dropout rate (the dropout rate for the area was estimated at 10% for the first eight months of the 1977-78 year).

ALC Students

The 156 students enrolled in the ALC over the 1978-79 and 1979-80 school years were quite similar to the CIP interns. Approximately half were dropouts and half were potential dropouts who had records of truancy, poor academic performance, and encounters with the law. In both programs, typical students had negative attitudes toward their former schools. The average age of the students was 16, although a few students as young as 14 were also served. The majority of the students in both programs had achieved tenth-grade status at the time of enrollment.

The ALC students differed from the CIP students in two important ways. First, although a large number of the ALC students (approximately 49%) came from families where parents worked in construction, trucking, coal mining, security, food services, and maintenance jobs, the remainder represented a broad range of socioeconomic levels. A few came from families where parents were on the university faculty. The second difference was that 98% of the ALC students were white and only 2% Black, as opposed to the predominantly Black CIP population.

Program Treatment

The ALC treatment consists of three major elements: instruction, career education, and counseling. These elements are discussed below in greater detail along with program climate and assessment which are two supporting elements of the ALC. These three components are similar to those of the CIP's, although such ALC features as half-day sessions, skills training, and the return of students to the regular high school to receive their diplomas differentiate the two programs.

Instruction. ALC instruction consists of individual and small-group (two or three students) assignments in reading, math, social studies, science, literature, and grammar. The individual assignments differ for each student on the basis of the student's academic needs as determined by standardized tests and specific content area placement tests ranging from elementary to college level skills. Students attend either the morning or afternoon sessions of the ALC depending on their work or skills-training-center schedules. They are assigned to the ALC in groups of no more than 15 or 16 students per half-day session.

The kinds of assignments worked on each day are primarily left up to the students who are encouraged to be responsible for their own learning. Typical assignments include work involving programmed instructional materials, workbooks, and textbooks. Research-related assignments such as report writing and verbal presentations are also made. Small group sessions are held periodically to discuss current events and literature readings.

One major difference between the ALC's instructional program and the CIP's is that the ALC curriculum does not emphasize the "fusion" of careers with the academic subjects. Academic activities related to occupations are sometimes incorporated into the lessons (computing rates of interest in business math, for example, is related to banking), but the ALC program does not emphasize this area. The instructional program has a strictly academic focus with a heavy emphasis on minimum proficiency level skills that will enable students to pass the GED.

Career Education. Only two elements of the ALC's career education program are similar to the CIP's; the job-preparation activities, and the career-education activities. Both programs provide students with job-related skills such as resume writing, interviewing, and completing job applications. Rather than having a formal Career Counseling Seminar like the CIP's (in which all students receive such training) the ALC provides either group or individual instruction. Group instruction consists of participation in the job preparation classes usually held just prior to placement of the students on a job. Students choosing to work alone are given individual learning packets, somewhat like those used in the CIP, which have been designed to cover seven job preparation topics, including social security and the labor laws. They also work on career-related pamphlets and use career-related audio-visual programs.

The ALC's monthly career education seminars, like the CIP's Career Day Seminars, are held to inform students of the world of work, particularly about what it takes to get a job and the kinds of work activities required. Resource persons from the military, local banks, retail businesses, and other occupations are invited in for the seminars. As is the case with the CIP, these persons sometimes set up displays and conduct job recruitment activities. The ALC's career-education activities, however, are less varied and frequent than the CIP's.

A unique feature of the ALC's career education program is its placement of students in part-time jobs or in the county's skills training center program. For those students choosing part-time work, the ALC's career education teacher tries to place them in jobs related to their career interests, although typical job placements are in fast food services and retail stores. Students choosing to participate in the county's vocational technical center program are trained in occupations such as auto mechanics, nursing, welding, building and grounds maintenance, construction, and child care. Students may participate in the part-time jobs or the vocational technical center throughout their entire stay at the ALC. They generally attend the jobs or the skills center for half of each day of the week. They are monitored on a monthly basis by skills center personnel and by the career education teacher who also solicits evaluations of students from employers.

Counseling. Like students in the CIP, ALC students receive individual academic, personal, and career-related counseling. The intensiveness of the counseling, however, distinguishes the two programs. Unlike the CIP's individual conferences, scheduled to occur every two weeks, ALC students are scheduled for four initial conferences upon entering the program. Any additional conferences are scheduled at the students' initiation. The counselor does schedule conferences intermittently throughout the year, but only to keep abreast of the students' progress and to provide them with opportunities to initiate additional counseling sessions.

Group counseling occurs once a week at the ALC. During these sessions, students voice their concerns about personal and program matters in much the same manner as do the CIP students in their biweekly group counseling sessions. The students are also informed about new program developments. In both the CIP and ALC, counselors and teachers work together to plan the session. In the CIP, additional group counseling, primarily in the career area, is provided through Career Counseling Seminars (CCS) which are held on a daily basis throughout the first semester of the program.

One feature of the ALC's counseling program that is similar to the CIP's is the involvement of all of the staff in the counseling process. Teachers provide informal academic counseling as they review the students' work. Similarly, the career developer provides career counseling as students are assisted in completing the job preparation materials. Disposition conferences, similar to the CIP's disposition conferences, are also held on a weekly basis to review the students' progress and to get a consensus from the staff on additional counseling needed by the students.

Student Assessment

The major distinction between the ALC's student assessment program and that of the CIP is that the ALC assessment is an informal process. Students entering both programs are given diagnostic and placement tests, but students in the ALC do not receive periodic (i.e., four times a year) formal assessments (report cards) as do the CIP students. Instead, ALC students receive daily verbal feedback about their progress on individual assignments. As is the case with the CIP, student assessment involves all segments of the staff. Weekly staff meetings are held to discuss each student's progress and to inform staff members of areas he or she needs to work on to prepare for the GED. Each staff member has primary responsibility for the academic programs of approximately eight students, although the responsibility for specific students may shift from time to time, depending upon the content area in which the student needs work.

When students meet the minimum proficiency requirements in specific skills, they are encouraged by the staff to take the GED. The other requirements for taking the test are that students be at least 17 years old and that their former high school class must have graduated.

In addition to the informal assessments from all the ALC staff, students are also assessed by their employers and the staff at the vocational skills center. Thus, the career education teacher is informed about the students' total progress. These assessments are made on a monthly basis and are used by the career education teacher in designing additional job preparation activities for the students.

ALC Climate

The ALC climate has a number of features common to the CIP's climate. Like the CIP staff, the ALC staff is concerned with both the academic and the psychological well-being of the student. All staff members attempt to provide a supportive but firm climate. In both programs, students work with staff individually or in small groups, although in the CIP this opportunity does not exist as often since the student to teacher ratio is higher. Also, in both programs, students receive special attention and positive reinforcement. Finally, students in the two programs are held accountable for behaviors such as truancy and absence, although the ALC's sanctions relative to such behaviors are more clearly specified.

Two features of the ALC's climate distinguish it from the CIP's. First, the ALC does not have a dress code. The function of the CIP's dress code is to provide students with a sense of the importance of dress, particularly as it is related to the world-of-work rules. The absence of a dress code in the ALC is perceived as a way to keep open communications among the staff and students. Thus, blue jeans are acceptable attire for both staff and students.

Second, the ALC students are involved in program decisions more formally than are the CIP interns. The ALC's weekly Council Meetings allow students to voice their concerns about the programs and to learn of new program developments. These council meetings resemble the CIP's group counseling sessions in which students voice their concerns about dress, attendance, and other school rules. In the ALC, however, students are given a formal role in making such decisions, rather than an informal one. In both programs, however, the staff seeks and considers student opinions.

Personnel

The ALC program is staffed by four full-time persons, a director/counselor, two academic teachers, and a career education teacher. All members of the staff are employees of the Monongalia County School System (MCSS) and hold secondary teaching certificates in accordance with State Department of Education regulations. Although the staff is small, only about half of the students are in school at one time (the others are working). The student teacher ratio is thus about 7 to 1, substantially lower than the CIP's 15 interns to every teacher.

"Well qualified" staff are a must for the ALC program. In addition to being certified in the appropriate subject areas, all staff members must have a minimum overall grade point average of 2.5. At present, three of the four staff members have master's degrees. All are white (matching the ethnicity of the students) and young (average age is 32).

Although the ALC program is funded entirely by the MCSS, it is administered solely by the director/counselor. Approximately 30% of the director/counselor's time is spent performing administrative tasks such as supervising staff, handling the budget, and representing the project at county and local school meetings. The rest of the director/counselor's time is spent in teaching and counseling students. The role of the director/counselor is different from the CIP's director who spends the majority of his/her time in administrative tasks. The ALC program is small in comparison to the CIP and thus does not require as much program monitoring and supervision. (The CIP has as many as 150 students on site at a given time, compared to 15 or 16 at the ALC.)

One other distinguishing feature of the ALC's management is that its director has more autonomy than the CIP's director. Unlike the CIP's director, the ALC director has complete control over the budget and does not require the MCSS's approval of material and supply orders. In regard to hiring staff, the ALC director also has autonomy, although all personnel selected must receive the official endorsement of the ALC's Advisory Council and Superintendent of Schools. In the CIP demonstration, RMC concluded that the director's lack of autonomy in hiring and firing staff sometimes diminished his/her effectiveness.

Both the director/counselor and the CIP director are required to have master's degrees. The ALC director is not required, however, to have two years administrative experience, as is the CIP director. This lack of prior administrative experience is not thought to have had a negative effect on the ALC's program management. It should be noted that the ALC director acquired the position through tenure at the project, as opposed to being hired from outside the project.

As mentioned, the ALC director also serves as the program's counselor. As such, he/she is responsible for advising students with personal and academic concerns and referring them to outside social service resources. A distinction between the ALC's counselor and the CIP's counselors is that the former places primary emphasis upon the student's personal development. The CIP counselors are equally concerned with the student's academic problems and post graduation plans.

The career education teacher's position in the ALC is comparable to that of the CIP's job developers. In both programs, the primary responsibility of these persons is to locate job experiences for students. However, part-time work is sought for the ALC students while two, two-week Hands-On experiences are sought for the CIP interns. Also in both programs, these persons conduct reviews of the work sites and prepare students for the world-of-work. One distinction, however, is that the ALC career education teacher is completely responsible for this preparation while it is shared by teachers, counselors, and job developers at the CIP.

Like the CIP instructors, the ALC teachers are responsible for coordinating and evaluating all aspects of the students' academic program. One major distinction, however, is that students in the ALC plan their own instructional program. Consequently, their instructors serve more as coordinators than do the CIP instructors. Another distinction is that the ALC program is totally individualized for each student. Thus the chief role of the instructors is to tutor students. On occasion the instructors coordinate the small group sessions, but lecturing or engaging the entire class in an open discussion is not one of their tasks as it is for the CIP instructors.

The final distinction to be made between the ALC teachers and the CIP instructors is in the subjects they teach. Although teachers in both programs have subject area specializations, the ALC teachers are responsible for more than one subject area (sometimes for as many as three subject areas). The CIP design does not call for the teaching of courses outside one's areas of specialization, although this occurred in the field test demonstration. This difference probably relates both to the ALC's small staff (necessitating that teachers deal with multiple subjects) and to the GED orientation of the GLC.

Recruitment

Approximately half the students referred to the ALC are in-school youth and the other half are dropouts. During the program's early years of operation in-school referrals came from the schools themselves (about 54%), the probation office (20%), and community agencies (6%). The remaining 20% were self-referrals (Zuckerman, 1978). The majority of the dropouts were referred by a "street counselor" (44%). Other referrals were through community agencies (11%) and the parent/legal guardian and probation office (7.5% each). Thirty percent of the dropouts were self-referred. Currently, the majority of referrals come from former students and their parents. The majority of the students (77%) come from three schools in the area but the ALC students have former affiliations with a total of 12 county schools.

Students referred to the ALC must be between 14 and 17 years of age and residents of Monongalia County, must read at a fourth grade level, and must be students who do not have severe behavioral problems. Upon acceptance into the ALC program, they are given a one-week orientation before the instructional program begins.

Facilities

The ALC's facility, like the CIP's facility, bears little resemblance to a regular public school. One distinction between the two programs, however, is that the ALC building is new and is located in a middle-income neighborhood. Both programs provide office space for all the staff. The ALC instructors, however, share the large open classroom space while the CIP instructors teach in separate classrooms.

Funds

The ALC is funded solely by the county, although in its first year of operation (1976), it received 90% Federal support and 5% each of State and local support. One factor thought to be related to the ALC's success in obtaining funds is that the program was supported from the outset by the county's schools. (The ALC program was originally conceived by county school and court system personnel.)

Relations with the Local Education Agency

Since its inception, the ALC has operated under the umbrella of the County School System. As such, the program is treated like all the other schools in the county and is allowed to manage its own operation.

It was mentioned earlier that one option of ALC students is to return to the high schools to earn their diplomas. This is especially true for students under the age of 16. Consequently, the ALC aims to maintain positive relations with the 12 schools from which students are recruited. For example, it is careful to admit only those students for whom transcripts have been received. Also at monthly principal's meetings, the director discusses the school's operational changes and provides an updated account on the school's status to each principal who has referred students.

So far only a few students have requested transfers to the high schools for regular diplomas. One difficulty for these students is that a county-wide policy about transfering academic credit has not yet been completely established. The ALC program staff is optimistic that a standardized policy will be established soon.

Relations with the Community

The placement both of ALC and CIP students in part-time jobs depends upon positive relations with representatives from the public and private sectors, as does the CIP's placement of students in their Hands-On experiences. Both programs have an Advisory Council to recommend resource personnel and guest speakers for the project, and to assist in promoting the program in the community. The ALC Advisory Council also plays a policy-setting role. In both programs, however, the Advisory Councils have not assisted as much as was expected with the placement of students in jobs. In fact, the two programs have relied upon the personal contacts of their career staff to place students. In the CIP, not enough time was available to meet with the council as often as was needed. In the ALC, the staff have not yet needed help from the council since part-time placements have not been difficult to obtain in the small rural area where the program is located.

Analysis of the ALC Evaluation Outcomes

The 1978-79 and 1979-80 ALC evaluations include measures of four outcomes: enrollment, retention, graduation, and placement. The program maintained an average monthly enrollment of 35 students and over the two-year period enrolled a total of 156 youth. Of these 156 students, 73 (47%) remained in the program, 73 dropped out, and 10 (6%) returned to the regular high school in pursuit of a regular high school diploma. The program enabled 63 youths to earn GED diplomas, 47 (75%) of whom were placed in full-time jobs, college, the military, or an OJT program.

Enrollment

The ALC program operates at full capacity with an average of 35 students. The open-entry, open-exit policy of the program requires that vacant student slots be filled once a month, boosting the program's enrollment back to the 35-student average. The 1978-79 ALC evaluation reported 100 students enrolled. The following year 78 were enrolled, 56 (72%) of whom were new enrollees. Thus, over the two-year period 156 students were served. The program maintained an average of 35 students per month and a waiting list of approximately 15 eligible students.

The ALC did not experience any difficulty in meeting its planned enrollment. Four factors are thought to be related to the program's ability to attract youths. First, the program is small in an area with significant numbers of dropouts and potential dropouts. Second, the program's first-come, first-serve policy with monthly intake enhances access. Students do not have to pass a test to get in, and may enter as soon as space becomes available. The maximum amount of time that a student had to wait to enter the program was three months.

A third factor thought to be related to the ALC's enrollment success is that students are referred from schools all over the county, rather than from one or two high schools. In the CIP demonstration, the recruitment of students was enhanced when additional high schools were included in the catchment area.

The final factor is the accelerated nature of the program. Students are able to graduate in a relatively short period of time (anywhere from three to 10 months). The ALC staff indicated that for many students, this is an incentive to attend the ALC. The possibility of shortening the time to graduation was also reported as an inducement to CIP participants.

Retention

The ALC's termination policy, like the CIP's, is designed to encourage students to remain in the program. Moreover, its policy is enforced without exception. As students enter the program, they are made aware of the program's attendance and discipline rules (through signed student contracts). They are terminated for such reasons as intoxication, possession and/or use of drugs or weapons, and attendance. The termination process generally occurs in four stages. The first sanction for violation of the student attendance contract--not in school for two days--is a telephone call home to the parents (or the student, as the case may be) to remind the student of his or her contract obligations and to encourage the student to return to school. For a second offense, the student is suspended for a three-day period with the understanding that the program would like the student to return. Over the three-day period, the student is to reevaluate the personal benefits of his or her involvement in the program and is to also think about the consequences of termination. The third offense is sanctioned by a one-month suspension. After four offenses the student's slot becomes open for another enrollee. Students in the CIP are also generally given second chances, although the sanctions for the various offences are not generally defined so explicitly as they are in the ALC program.

The ALC program reports indicate that the program retained 83 (53%) of the 156 youths enrolled over the two-year period. 73 (47%) remained in the ALC program, and 10 (6%) returned to the regular high school to earn a diploma. Since one goal of the ALC is to encourage students to earn regular high school diplomas, the 10 returnees are included in the count of students retained in the program. During the first year, 62 of the 100 enrolled youths were retained. The following year 21 (34%) of these youth re-enrolled, along with 56 new enrollees. Of these 77 students, 42 (55%) remained in the program. Of the 21 students who re-enrolled the second year, the ALC retained 14 (67%) compared with 28 (50%) of the new enrollees. Thus, as in the CIP, students who have invested more time in the program feel they are closer to completing their schooling and tend to stay on in the program.

As in the CIP, the primary reason for the terminations reported by the ALC program staff (as opposed to student reports) was attendance. Of the 73 students terminated over the two-year period, 48 (66%) were because of poor attendance. In the second year's evaluation, a larger proportion of youths (72%) were terminated for attendance. It is not entirely clear that ALC program factors such as stronger compliance to the school's rules, or changes in school policy, are related to this difference between the two years. In the CIP demonstration, however, tightening of attendance policy had a positive effect on attendance, but had an adverse effect upon program retention.

Graduation

Students attending the ALC program have the option of preparing for a GED at the ALC or returning to the regular high school at a later date (usually within three months) to earn a regular high school diploma. The GED option requires that students be over 17 years of age and that the high school class of which they were a member has already graduated or will do so within three months. Regular attendance at the ALC is also a requirement, although a minimum number of days required is not specified.

The academic goal of 96% of the students who enter the ALC program is to earn a GED; the goal of the other 4% is to return to the high school for a regular diploma. This latter group of youth is generally younger (most are 14 and 15 years old) and is strongly encouraged by the ALC staff to return to their schools.

During the 1978-79 year, 33 of the 100 enrollees earned their GEDs in approximately six months time. The following year 30 (38%) of the 78 enrollees earned their GEDs. Since the State GED requirements changed (increasing from six months to one year the length of time students had to be out of school prior to taking the GED), the average length of stay in the program for these students was 10 months compared with 6 months for the graduates in the preceding year. In both years, the number of GED graduates exceeded the ALC's goal of enabling 75% of those eligible to earn their GEDs. Out of 34 eligible students, 33 (97%) passed the test in 1978-79. In the following year, 30 (97%) of the 31 eligible candidates earned their GEDs.

Placement

The ALC places students who wish part-time work in part-time jobs, many of which lead to full-time employment once the students graduate. During the 1978-79 year, 18 (55%) of the 33 graduates were placed in full-time jobs, 3 (9%) each were placed in college and the military, and 1 was placed in an OJT program. The following year, 22 (73%) of the 30 GED graduates were employed, in OJT programs, or in college. Of the 30 graduates, 13 (43%) were engaged in full-time employment, 3 (10%) were in the military, 3 were in OJT programs, 1 student was working part-time. Two students entered college.

Summarized over the two-year period, the ALC placed 31 (49%) of its 63 graduates in full-time employment, 6 (9%) in the military, 5 (8%) in college, 4 (6%) in OJT programs, and 1 (2%) in part-time employment. Of the 63 graduates, 14 (22%) were neither employed nor pursuing further academic careers. Two other students were married females with young children.

The placement outcomes mentioned are thought to match the expectations of the ALC staff and students. The ALC staff commented that Morgantown is a small town where students tend to live close to their families. Only a few students are expected to go off to college, primarily because the town does not offer many employment opportunities for college graduates. Many students enter occupations similar to those of other members of their families.

COMPARISON 2:

HARBOR CITY LEARNING PROGRAM:
EXPERIENCE-BASED CAREER EDUCTAION
Baltimore, Maryland

Program Overview

The Harbor City Learning Program (HCL) is a year round alternative school for economically disadvantaged students, 90% of whom are high school dropouts. The program is a cooperative effort between the Mayor's Office of Manpower Resources (MOMR) and the Baltimore City Public School System (BCPS). Its major goals are to enable students to earn high school diplomas or GEDs and to help them obtain meaningful work experiences that develop into full-time employment.

The HCL is organized into five mini-schools or clusters, only one of which focuses on career education--the Experience-Based Career Education (EBCE) cluster. The other four clusters provide specific skills training and are not comparable to the CIP.

In addition to being able to earn a high school diploma faster than in the regular public school, students in the HCL/EBCE cluster are also given the opportunity to explore various careers. The EBCE cluster has three major offerings: a career-related instructional program, paid work experiences, and a social services program where students receive counseling, child care, and placement services. Each month the students spend 60 hours each in the instructional and work experience programs.

The EBCE instructional program is individualized and integrates academic activities with the work experience activities. Students spend the bulk of their class time on individually assigned project activities that incorporate reading, math, social studies, and other academic content with life skills (resume writing, interviewing), and work activities. During the mornings they work in specific subject areas and use learning activities packages (LAPs), career-related project planning packages, and programmed materials. They also attend special remedial reading or math classes. Although classes are held throughout the day, students generally spend the afternoons at job sites working with community resource persons to complete their project assignments. Class sizes are small with no more than 18 students assigned to one learning coordinator (teacher).

Students gain valuable work experience in at least seven occupations while attending the EBCE program. Each month they spend an average of 60 hours at either a public- or private-sector job related to their career interests. Typical work experiences include auto mechanics, welding, horticulture, and veterinarian work. Academic credit and a biweekly stipend are provided.

The EBCE social services program provides individual academic, personal, and family counseling in addition to child care and placement services. Students receive crisis and scheduled counseling from an on-site counselor, the learning coordinators, and from staff at the MOMR Youth Assessment Center (YAC). For students who have children between six months and five years old, the EBCE provides a full-time day care center where, in addition to child care, parent classes are provided in health, nutrition, and child development. Finally, prior to graduation, students are referred to the transition unit of the YAC where they are provided assistance in job, college, or OJT placements.

The EBCE 1978-79 and 1979-80 evaluation reports included data in five outcome areas: enrollment, attendance, retention, graduation, and placement. The program enrolled 81 students during the 1978-79 year and 114 the following year. School attendance was slightly less than the 90% performance standard (89%), although work-site attendance exceeded the standard (92%). The reported retention rate was 85% for 1978-79. This figure is confounded, however, with "positive terminations" (students who enrolled in school or a non-CETA funded program within 60 days of separation from the EBCE program). No retention data were reported for the following year. The EBCE program graduated 3 students in 1978-79 and 35 in 1979-80. Over the two years, it placed 25 (66%) of the graduates in either full-time subsidized or unsubsidized employment, college, or an OJT program.

Analysis of HCL/EBCE Components

Like the CIP, the HCL/EBCE project is designed to help economically disadvantaged dropout and potential dropouts graduate from high school. The students served by the two programs are quite similar. The contexts in which they operate and some of the features they offer are also alike. A major difference between the two programs is that the EBCE is an LEA-operated program, rather than a community-based program like the CIP. In addition, the EBCE has a number of features not found in the CIP, including paid work experiences and day care.

Context

The HCL program was started as a neighborhood Youth Corps program in 1973. It was developed by the MOMR in conjunction with the BCPS. The program was to impact upon the city's truancy and dropout problems. Part-time, paid work was offered as an incentive to prevent students from leaving school and to get others to return.

The EBCE component of the HCL program was added in 1978, as part of the national EBCE effort. The goals of the EBCE cluster were also to enable students to graduate (either earn a high school diploma or a GED) and to provide them with paid work experiences in the community that would expose them to careers.

Like three of the replication CIPs, the EBCE program is located in a large, low-income urban area which has been affected by a high youth unemployment rate and a high dropout rate. Of those entering ninth grade, for example, 42% drop out prior to graduation (Youthwork proposal, 1978). The project is housed in a manpower services building. Like the CIP's facility, it bears little resemblance to the schools the students have left behind.

Students

The approximately 90 students per year who attended the EBCE program were predominantly Black (83%) low-income youth, the majority of whom had dropped out of school (90%). The youth were between the ages of 16 and 21. Like the CIP interns, many of them dropped out because of economic, academic, or social problems that made it difficult for them to continue school, or because they had been rejected by their home schools. Many also had poor attendance and truancy records. Very few (less than 10%) had previous minor encounters with the law.

Program Treatment

Students attending the EBCE program are required to complete the program in two years. During their stay, they receive individualized career-related instruction, paid work experiences, counseling, and day care and placement services. Students are assessed upon entry into the program and at the end of each trimester. Throughout their stay in the EBCE cluster, they are made to feel responsible for their actions and especially for their learning.

Instruction. EBCE instruction consists of approximately 60 hours per month of individualized activities in basic skills (reading, math, social studies, language arts, and science), life skills (interpersonal relationships, job retention skills), and career education. The instructional program begins with a two week orientation cycle during which the students attend life skills workshops covering such areas as job search and job retention, sex role stereotyping, tax, credit, life-management planning, and program expectations. This two-week orientation period is similar to the CIP's CCS class where students are taught proper interview behaviors, resume writing, and world-of-work behaviors. At the end of the orientation, the participants are tested and interviewed by a learning coordinator who draws up individual academic and vocational profiles. The information is used to place the participants in one of the five learning coordinator's classes.

Unlike the CIP interns, EBCE students are grouped into self-contained homerooms of no more than 18 students. They work primarily on individually assigned projects that are negotiated with the learning coordinators. The projects consist of assignments in basic skills, life skills, and careers that can be completed at the EBCE center, at job sites, or at other resource places. In general, the EBCE classes are held throughout the school day at the center. Students also attend biweekly employer seminars. A special learning laboratory class is held once a week for students requiring special remediation.

The projects that make up the bulk of students' work in the EBCE classes combine academic activities with career and life skill activities. They may last for as long as six weeks. In carrying out the individually assigned projects, students work on project planning packages (teacher-made career exploration materials that provide career ideas to pursue), learning activities packages (teacher-made, basic skills improvement materials similar to the CIP's learning packets), exploration packets (packages that focus on a specific career), or on other specific assignments that require them to interact with community resource persons (e.g., interviewing a potential employer, or visiting a child care center or museum). Students learn job search skills, resume writing, job attitudes and behavior effectiveness. At the end of the project (which can last for six weeks and which, in many instances, becomes part of the work-experience activity) students write reports, make multi-media presentations, or become certified by designated resource persons.

In addition to project activities, students are assigned workbook and textbook activities, and programmed materials when they are tutored by the learning coordinator. Also, on a biweekly basis, they attend employer seminars where resource persons from the community (e.g., pharmacists, photographers, morticians, realtors, engineers) discuss such issues as trends occurring nationally in their occupations, retirement, career mobility, and the changing work ethic. These employer seminars are similar to the CIP's Career Day activities held periodically throughout the year. Finally, students keep journals aout their experiences so they can draw connections between learning and other aspects of their life.

Work experience. During the school day, EBCE students generally alternate between classes and work. They spend approximately 60 hours a month at job sites in the community. There they are provided first-hand knowledge about their chosen careers. This work experience is more elaborate than the CIP's where students spend two weeks at two job sites related to their career interests. At the job sites, EBCE students actually participate in work activities. They experience such occupations as construction, radiology, graphics, zoo caretaking, law, and retail sales. The students are placed in public- and private-sector jobs like the CIP students, but unlike the CIP interns, EBCE students are paid (from EBCE funds) on a biweekly basis. In both programs, students are given academic credit for the work experience.

Throughout the HCL/EBCE work experience, students meet a variety of community resource persons. Not only are they assigned to different work experiences, but they also rotate among job sites. In addition, they are often placed at sites where they participate in regular job training programs (e.g., training in computer programming). The community resource persons and the learning coordinator monitor and evaluate the students on a daily basis. During the summer months students attend EBCE half a day and alternate between classes and the work experience sites. They are also monitored and evaluated during the summer.

Social services. Except for day care services, the EBCE social-service program is quite similar to the CIP's. Both programs provide academic, personal, and family counseling, although in the CIP such counseling takes place on a scheduled and more frequent basis (i.e., twice a week) rather than on a "crisis" and "as desired" basis. Also in both programs counselors, instructors, and the administrative staff (director and cluster coordinator) provide counseling. One difference between the two programs, however, is that the EBCE does not provide scheduled daily group seminars like the CIP's CCS classes.

The HCL/EBCE's mechanism for student placements operates more formally than the CIP's. During the school year, the counselor maintains a resource library center where students can make use of information on careers, colleges, and social service agencies. Also, approximately 60 days prior to graduation, the MOMR transitional staff provide placement counseling to those students requesting it. Every attempt is made to place students in colleges, jobs, or OJT programs, as in the CIP.

Day care services are provided by HCL/EBCE to help students with young children attend school more frequently and to assist students in parenting. Classes are provided in such areas as nutrition, sexuality, health care, and child development.

Student assessment. Students receive formal assessments of their progress in the EBCE program three times a year, at the end of each trimester. Students in the CIP receive assessments at the middle and end of each term. Thus, the CIP provides twice as many formal evaluations. Both programs provide assessment upon entry into the program so that an instructional plan matched to the student's needs and interests can be developed. Informal assessment takes place in both programs, but only the CIP holds meetings between counselors and teachers to render complete assessments of the students every two weeks.

Three features of the EBCE program distinguish it from the CIP. The first is that EBCE provides a final assessment (provided by the MOMR transitional staff of the Youth Assessment Center) of all potential graduates who desire one 60 days prior to their graduation. Second, the EBCE program solicits a monthly assessment from employers of such student work behaviors as attendance, promptness, and dependability. These assessments are reported to the learning coordinator who, in turn, provides further instruction to students in the areas needed. Finally, an integral part of the assessment is to determine which students can meet the program's graduation goals. Students who have completed their second year at the EBCE program can return to it the following trimester if and only if they can complete all requirements for their high school diploma in that one trimester. In contrast, the CIP solicits evaluations from Hands-On suppliers at the end of an intern's placement. The CIP also assesses credits toward graduation each term and provides post-graduation counseling and assessment.

Climate. Like the CIP, the EBCE program provides an atmosphere for learning that is supportive, rewarding, and unpressured, but that also encourages student responsibility. Both programs have dress codes and small groupings where the teachers and students can interact more frequently and where students can receive individual and special attention. The two programs also hold students accountable for such behaviors as tardiness, attendance, and truancy. In the EBCE program, however, the policy regarding these behaviors is more strict. For example, a single unexcused absence for a new enrollee requires a conference with the student's parents and placement of the student on probation. A second unexcused absence during a trimester results in termination from the program.

A distinguishing element of the EBCE climate is the extent to which the program involves students in decision-making activities related to their instructional program. Unlike the CIP, where students have little involvement in instructional decision-making, the EBCE students are expected to negotiate project activities with the learning coordinators, including time frames for completing the projects. They also negotiate the amount of credit and the type of evaluations to be used in assessing their progress.

Personnel

The EBCE staff are provided by the MOMR and the BCPS. The MOMR personnel consist of staff at the Youth Enrollment and Youth Assessment Centers, staff at the Parent-Infant Center, and on-site support staff (i.e., the cluster coordinator, placement coordinator, data clerk and clerk/typist, custodial, and security staff). The BCPS staff consists of three administrative staff (i.e., principal, vice-principal, and academic credit specialist) and five learning coordinators (teachers). The roles of the EBCE staff are like those of the CIP staff except that the responsibilities assigned to one staff member in the CIP are often given to several persons in the EBCE program.

The EBCE on-site staff consists of 13 full-time personnel--one cluster coordinator, one placement coordinator, one counselor, five learning coordinators, and five support staff. This configuration provides a student-teacher ratio of 18 students to every learning coordinator, which is comparable to the CIP's ratio of 15 interns for every teacher. The HCL/EBCE program provides a ratio of 90 students for 1 counselor, however, compared with the CIP's student-to-counselor ratio of 35 to 1.

In general, the personnel recruited by the EBCE project are older and have more experience in their areas than do the CIP staff. For example, the five learning coordinators (teachers) collectively have more than 50 years teaching experience. Also, the majority of the teaching staff are in their mid- to late thirties, while the majority of the CIP's staff members are between the ages of 23 and 30. The staffs of both programs do reflect, however, the racial and ethnic backgrounds of the students.

The administrative and operational aspects of the HCL/EBCE program, particularly those related to the instructional staff, are handled by the principal and vice-principal who are also responsible for two other HCL clusters. The cluster coordinator is responsible for the administrative and operational aspects of the program, but only as they are related to the HCL/EBCE's non-instructional staff (i.e., placement coordinator, counselor, and other support staff mentioned above). This type of management differs from the CIP management where the director is responsible for the administrative and operational aspects of the program and can delegate some of these responsibilities to the instructional and career counseling supervisor.

The qualifications of the HCL/EBCE managerial staff (i.e., princial, vice-principal, and cluster coordinator) are comparable to those of the CIP director. For example, all three have three or more years administrative experience and have Bachelor's degrees plus credits equivalent to a Master's degree. One difference, however, is that the CIP director has more autonomy in such activities as hiring and monitoring staff than do the HCL/EBCE managers. In the EBCE, the principal and vice-principal are limited to hiring BCPS instructional staff who volunteer for the program. Also, while the principal and vice-principal monitor the entire program, the cluster coordinator (who is the only managerial staff member physically located at the HCL/EBCE site) monitors only the non-instructional aspects of the program (i.e., activities of the counselor, placement coordinator, and janitorial and clerical staff).

Like the CIP instructors, the HCL/EBCE learning coordinators guide, coordinate, and evaluate all aspects of the students' instructional plans. One difference between the two programs, however, is that CIP instructors teach classes in their areas of specialty, whereas the EBCE learning coordinators teach all subjects even though each is a specialist in reading, math, English, history, or science. Each learning coordinator is responsible for up to 18 students and provides individualized instruction in all subject areas.

The placement coordinator's position in the HCL/EBCE program is somewhat akin to the CIP's career developer position, although some tasks are shared by other HCL/EBCE staff. Like the career developer who locates Hands-On experiences, the placement coordinator locates community work experiences for the students. Also, the placement coordinator conducts monthly reviews of the work sites, with some help from the MOMR staff. A difference between these two roles is that the EBCE learning coordinators and cluster coordinator monitor students at the job site whereas, in the CIP, the job developer both places and monitors interns at the Hands-On sites.

The EBCE counselor performs many of the tasks that would be handled by the CIP counselors. However, instead of the CIP's workload of 35 students per counselor, the HCL/EBCE counselor is responsible for 90 students. The counselors in the two programs advise students about personal and academic problems, and assist them with college entrance and other post-graduation plans. Also in both programs, the counselors refer students to such outside social services resources as drug rehabilitation centers. They also assist with the resolution of student-employer problems. Unlike the CIP counselors, however, the HCL/EBCE counselor sees students as needed or as called for by a crisis situation, rather than on a scheduled basis.

Recruitment

Ninety percent of the referrals to the EBCE program are made by the MOMR YAC; the BCPS refers the remaining 10% of the EBCE students. All applicants undergo a three week pre-program eligibility assessment at the MOMR YAC. The staff there decide which HCL program is best for each student.

Students who enroll in the EBCE come from low-income families, are between the ages of 16 and 21, are local residents, and are dropouts or potential dropouts as are the CIP students. Also like the CIP, functional literacy is a requirement for entry into the EBCE.

The primary intake into the EBCE program occurs once a year, at the opening of the Fall term. Vacancies which result from terminations, graduations, or transfers are filled, however, at the start of the second and third trimesters. The maximum number of students that can be served in the EBCE at any one time is 90 students. Since 90% of the referrals are made by MOMR, the EBCE program needs only to be concerned about filling 10% of the total number of slots. Unlike the CIP, it has a large number (26) of schools from which it can recruit potential dropouts, and therefore does not spend a great deal of effort designing and implementing recruitment strategies.

Facilities

The EBCE cluster of the HCL program is operated by the BCPS, but like the CIP, is housed in a facility that bears little resemblance to a public school. The facility is located on one floor of an old manpower services building. Office space is provided for the cluster coordinator and other non-instructional staff (counselor, placement coordinator) and a classroom is provided for each learning coordinator. (The principal and vice-principal are physically housed in one of the other HCL buildings although they make periodic visits to the EBCE building.) Both the EBCE and the CIP have lunch room facilities, but neither has recreational facilities. In the EBCE program physical education is not a requirement for graduation as it is in the CIP.

Funds

EBCE funds are provided by the MOMR and the BCPS under a contract negotiated each year. Funds for such support staff members as the cluster coordinator, placement coordinator, and counselor are provided by MOMR, whereas funds for the principal and teaching staff members are provided by the BCPS. Materials, equipment, and supplies needed by these personnel are provided by their corresponding agencies. Wages, fringe benefits, and payroll services for the students are paid with MOMR funds.

The EBCE budget is administered by the principal, although the MOMR offices must approve requests for furniture and equipment. This arrangement is somewhat comparable to that of the CIP where the director must also receive approval of requests for purchase. Unlike the CIP, however, the EBCE program has not experienced delays in program activities because of budget approval delays.

Relations with the Community

In the EBCE program, as in the CIP, the placement of students in work experiences related to their career interests requires that positive relations be established with the private- and public-sector employers. A formal advisory council, like that in the CIP, is not available as a resource to the EBCE project. Moreover, EBCE does not enjoy the contacts of a CBO, as does the CIP. But like the CIP, the majority of referrals come from program staff (learning coordinators/teachers and the placement coordinators) who use prior personal associations with employers or their current knowledge of available community resources to place students in work sites. Other placements have come from students who have made contacts through class projects.

Over the course of a year, the EBCE program places each student in over seven different work experiences. Like the CIP, some initial difficulties were experienced with employers such as lawyers, public service agencies, computer firms, and construction agencies. These employers tended to be concerned about confidentiality of information, equipment breakage, and employer liability. Also, the employers' previous negative experiences with Federal programs precipitated some unwillingness to provide student placements. The CIPs' staffs were able to develop strong linkages with the community primarily as a result of their association with OIC, a well known community-based organization. Similarly, the EBCE program's affiliation with HCL and the BCPS was a factor leading to successful work-site placements. Being able to link the EBCE program with the BCPS is considered by the program staff as a key element in the program's ability to place students.

Analysis of the EBCE Evaluation Outcomes

The 1978-79 and 1979-80 EBCE evaluation documents include data on enrollment, attendance, retention, graduation, and placement. The program enrolled 81 and 114 students respectively for the two years. In-school attendance figures were reported at 89% for the first year's evaluation. No data on school attendance were reported for the second year. Work-site attendance was 92% in both years.

An 85% retention rate was reported, although this figure is inflated by "positive terminations" (students who dropped out but soon enrolled in another program). Of the 81 students enrolled in the 1978-79 school year, EBCE was able to re-enroll 36 (44%) the next year. Of the 114 students who enrolled in the program the following year, 66 (58%) were retained. The evaluation reported 3 and 35 graduates respectively for the two years. Of the 38 graduates, 16 (42%) were placed in full-time subsidized or unsubsidized employment, and 8 (21%) were placed in college or OJT programs. Only one student was unemployed. The whereabouts of the 12 (32%) remaining students was not known.

Enrollment

The EBCE enrollment objectives for the 1978-79 and 1979-80 years were to admit 90 students between the ages of 16 and 21, 90% of whom were dropouts and all of whom were Baltimore city residents. With this number of participants, the program would be operating at full capacity. The number of students enrolled respectively for the two years were 81 and 114. (The 114 is explained by the fact that terminated students are replaced by new enrollees.)

The EBCE program experienced some difficulty in meeting the first year's enrollment objectives, even though it received referrals from 26 BCPS high schools. At least two factors appear to be related to the difficulty. During the 1978-79 year, EBCE did its own recruitment, since the MOMR Youth Assessment Center had not yet been set up to handle EBCE as a new cluster. Thus all the preliminary screening of applicants had to be completed in addition to other equally important implementation tasks. The task turned out to take longer than anticipated, as it did in the CIP, and not enough time was available for its completion.

A second factor thought to be related to the difficulty in enrolling students was that the EBCE program had to complete for enrollees with the Youth Entitlement Program. In the CIP demonstration, the availability of youth for the program was also affected by the presence of competing programs.

During the second year, the EBCE program did not experience difficulty in meeting its enrollment objective of 90 students. A factor thought to be related is that the MOMR staff at the Youth Enrollment Center took responsibility for recruiting 90% of the students.

Attendance

The attendance standards set for the overall HCL program were to maintain 90% school and work attendance. The EBCE component fell slightly short of this criterion for in-school attendance during the 1978-79 school year (in-school attendance was 89%), but it exceeded the criterion for work attendance (work attendance was 92%). Attendance did not decline during the summer months as it did in the CIP.

Several factors are thought to be related to the EBCE program's high attendance. One factor is its strict attendance policy that requires an 85% attendance rate for each student. Students who are absent more than eight times a trimester (at either school or work) are terminated. New enrollees in the program are permitted one unexcused absence and are terminated with a second unexcused absence. For second-year EBCE students, the attendance requirements are even stricter. These students are terminated on their first unexcused absence. The only absences that are excused are death in the family documented by a note from the funeral parlor, illness documented by a doctor's note, and a court appearance documented by a subpoena or note from the court clerk. The EBCE program students view the attendance rules as strictly enforced, but do not complain that they are harshly enforced (Jobs Watch, 1980).

Other factors thought to be related to the high attendance rates are the provision of paid work experience, the accelerated nature of the program, and the half-day summer sessions. For many HCL/EBCE students, the paid work experience is an incentive since many of them (25%) provide for families (Jobs Watch, 1980). Also, half-day sessions during the summer do not interfere with other summer jobs students may hold, or with warm summer afternoons. In the CIP, the need for summer employment and the reluctance of students to attend classes while their non-CIP peers were on vacation were thought to be primary reasons for the decline in summer school attendance. Given these findings, the half-day school sessions and the paid work experience would appear to be useful approaches for improving summer school attendance.

Retention

The EBCE termination policy, like the attendance policy, is quite strict. Students are terminated for such reasons as academic problems, attendance, disciplinary problems, and dissatisfaction with the program. The same is true for the CIP interns. The EBCE program, unlike the CIP, however, has a formal Student Review Committee (which consists of teachers and students) that imposes sanctions upon students for violations of their contracts. (The student contracts outline the attendance and performance requirements the students are expected to adhere to.) Chronic lateness, which is defined as being "late three times per trimester" carries a possible sanction of probation or termination. Students are immediately suspended for intoxication, posession and/or use of drugs or weapons, and physical attacks upon staff, other students, or employers. Also, only those students with sufficient credits to earn a high school diploma or GED in their second year are allowed to return to the program. In general, the CIP sanctions are not as inflexibly applied as those employed in the EBCE.

The 1978-79 evaluation report indicates that the EBCE program retained 67 (85%) of its 81 enrollees. Included in these figures, however, are positive terminations (participants who terminated from EBCE but who registered or enrolled in school or a non-CETA funded training program within 60 days after separation from the program). If the positive terminations are excluded from the estimate of program retention, the findings show that only 36 (44%) of the 81 enrollees were retained. Retention figures for the following year (excluding the positive terminations) indicated that of 114 students, 66 (58%) were retained. The termination rate for second-year students was slightly lower than for first-year students. Of the 36 returnees, 17 (47%) terminated compared with 41 (53%) of the 78 first-year students. The latter finding is not surprising since returnees are more likely to graduate from the program.

The two most frequently cited reasons for terminations for the two years respectively were: attendance (84% and 77%) and medical (6% and 7%). Attendance was also the most frequently cited reason for terminations by the CIP, although the proportions of students who were terminated for this reason did not exceed 29% in the CIP demonstration. A factor thought to be related to the high incidence of terminations is the EBCE's strict policy towards attendance and termination. The policy appears to be a useful one for attendance (since attendance figures were high), but it appears to have an adverse effect upon the program's capability to retain students.

Graduation

The EBCE requirements for a regular high school diploma are 85% attendance and a minimum of 20 credits. The program also offers a GED to students who want it and are able to pass the test. As a two-year program, students who do not show promise of completing their diplomas in the second year are not invited back to the program. Students may attend the program for an additional trimester after their second year, however, if one and only one additional trimester is needed to complete the program requirements.

During the 1978-79 year the EBCE program graduated three students. The following year 35 graduated. Of the 38 graduates, only two graduated with GEDs; the rest earned regular diplomas. In both years, the number of graduates was lower than was projected based on the number of entry credits and the maximum number of credits students could have earned. Four students could have graduated in the 1978-79 year, but only three (75%) did. In the following year, of the 45 possible graduates, 35 (78%) did graduate. It should be mentioned, however, that the EBCE program was able to graduate the majority of the students within its two-year standard time. In general, EBCE students do not need a longer time to graduate than expected. One contributing factor appears to be the program's strict policy towards graduation--two years, plus one and only one trimester. Without this criterion, it is not certain that the EBCE program would be able to graduate as many students as it did.

Placement

The goal of the overall HCL program is to place 50% of all program graduates in full-time subsidized jobs and 30% in full-time CETA subsidized jobs within two months of program completion. Unlike the CIP, the EBCE program does not expect that many of its students will go on into further education, so it incorporates into its curriculum activities and materials (resume writing, career exploration, job attitudes) that will prepare the students for direct entrance into an occupation.

Of the 38 1978-79 and 1979-80 graduates, follow-up data were reported for 25 (66%). Of these 25, 13 (52%) were placed in full-time jobs, 5 (20%) entered college, and 3 (12%) each entered the military and OJT programs. Only one student was not working. Altogether, the program was able to place 96% of the 25 graduates for whom follow-up data were available. If one were to assume that all of the students for whom no follow-up data were available were unplaced, the percentage of placements would fall to 63%. The actual placement percentage probably lies somewhere between these two extremes. It is noteworthy that a higher number of students entered college than anticipated.

One factor related to the EBCE program's success in job placements is the heavy emphasis it places on this endeavor. The EBCE center makes use of the MOMR to provide assistance in job placement. As mentioned, the career development plans of all potential graduates are forwarded to the center approximately 60 days prior to graduation. For students earning a GED, an "incentive" offered by the program is an increase in work experience from 60 hours per month (approximately one-third time) to 120 hours per month until the student is placed in a job or CETA-funded program. Also, students receive full-time jobs through their work experience contacts. This emphasis on direct job placement is different from the CIP where the emphasis is on the placement of students in college or other career-oriented, post-secondary situations.

COMPARISON 3:

INDEPENDENCE HIGH SCHOOL
Newark, New Jersey

Program Overview

Independence High School (IHS) is a private, non-profit alternative school for economically disadvantaged youth who have experienced serious difficulties with the public educational and criminal justice systems. The primary objectives of the program are to enable students to earn high school diplomas and to assist them in obtaining meaningful employment in the career fields of their choice. The program provides career and vocational education, basic academic skills improvement, academic credit for work experience, recreational programs, social services, and minimum wages for such purposes as meals, transportation, and personal expenses. The program is divided into three basic areas: instructional, vocational work experience, and social services. The regular school year is divided into four eight-week sessions. During each session half of the program participants attend school while the other half work. These roles are reversed each subsequent session. During the summer, all students attend school half of each weekday and work the other half day.

The IHS vocational work experience program is designed to provide students with a variety of work experiences to help them refine their career choices. As far as possible, an attempt is also made to match each student's career interest with his or her job placement. During the school year, students are placed in one or two jobs for an eight-week period each. Typical placements include construction, sales, health care, art, and social services. In addition to wages, students receive academic credit for the successful completion of each work activity.

The IHS instructional program is non-graded and invididualized, although some small- and large-group activities occur. Students are placed into one of two teams according to their reading ability. During the morning phase of the program, they receive instruction in reading, language arts, mathematics, and American studies. Students in Team I are taught in a small self-contained group (12 to 15 students), whereas students in Team II are taught in larger groups (25 to 35 students). The core materials used are textbooks, workbooks, reading laboratories, paperback libraries, magazines, and reference materials.

During the afternoon phase of the instructional program, students take special interest and special skills courses (e.g., photography, silk screening, psychology, Black history, science). Recreational activities and a Life Skills Seminar (where physical and mental health issues are discussed) are also held during several afternoons of the week. In addition, some students participate in a survival skills outdoor education class. Special events such as guest speakers, plays, and concerts are provided whenever possible.

The IHS social services program has eight components: individual and group counseling, intake, orientation, graduation preparation, legal services, health services, and therapeutic backup. Students meet regularly (and as needed) with their assigned social workers to discuss personal concerns, adjustment within the school programs, and family and home problems.

The IHS 1978-79 and 1979-80 evaluation reports included data about the program's success in meeting its enrollment, attendance, retention, and placement objectives. In-school, in-class, and work-site attendance was reported as 80% or better--10% higher than the average Board of Education homeroom figures. Work-site attendance was reported at higher than either the in-school or in-class attendance. The termination data showed that the program was able to retain almost 75% of the 110 students enrolled. Retention was higher for potential dropouts than for actual dropouts.

The IHS graduated 16 students, 8 of whom were placed in college, 3 in OJT programs, and 5 in full-time employment.

Analysis of IHS Components

Like the CIP, the IHS is designed to help dropouts and potential dropouts earn a high school diploma and obtain meaningful employment. The population served is quite similar to the CIP's, as are the context in which the school operates, the school's management, and its program components. One major difference between the IHS and the CIP is that the IHS program operates independently of the local school district and without the direct support of a community-based organization such as OIC. The IHS operates as a private, non-profit school and has a number of features not found in the CIP including paid work experience, placement in a job or post-secondary school as a criterion for graduation, and the grouping of students for academic courses based on their reading proficiency. The following description of the IHS details the major ways in which it differs from the CIP, although both programs attempt to accomplish quite similar objectives.

Context

Independence High School was founded as a private, non-profit alternative school in 1971 by a group of college instructors, VISTA volunteers, and 12 high school dropouts interested in having a school where the classes and atmosphere fit the needs of the students and staff (IHS Handbook, 1979-80). Over the years the student body grew from 12 to 110 students (by the 1978-79 school year). The ethnicity of the students has changed from predominantly white to 21% white, 64% Black, and 15% Hispanic.

The IHS is a fully accredited school program located in a renovated three-story house in a predominantly Portuguese section of the city. Like the CIP, it is housed in a separate facility apart from the public high schools. Although the city in which IHS is located is relatively small compared to three of the CIP sites, it is still plagued by a high crime rate, high youth unemployment (34-36%), and a high dropout rate (30% projected for the 1978-79 period).

Students

The 110 students served by the IHS during the 1978-79 school year were quite similar to the CIP interns. Approximately half were dropouts and half were potential dropouts who attended the public schools on an irregular basis, had records of truancy, and/or were poor academic performers. The median age of the students was 16, although students as young as 14 were served by IHS. Approximately 50% of the IHS students had been involved in at least minor scrapes with the law.

The IHS students apparently differed from the CIP interns in only one important way. Approximately 17% were beginning ninth graders and thus had not accumulated any credits toward graduation. CIP interns, on the other hand, were required to have earned half of the credits required for graduation prior to their entry into the program. (This requirement, however, was not always honored--especially when pressures to meet enrollment quotas became severe.)

Program Treatment

The treatment provided to IHS students consisted of the three major elements listed previously (instruction, social services, and work experience) plus two essential supporting ingredients--assessment and climate. These five components correspond closely with those of the CIP. Like the CIP, the IHS program treatment is concerned with the "whole person" and is not limited to the student's academic progress. Each student's physical, social, and psychological well-being are recognized as prerequisites of academic success and thus as legitimate program concerns.

While the five IHS components are quite similar to the CIP's, as is the overall "whole person" philosophy of the IHS, some activities are unique to the IHS. Notable among these are the paid work experience, the alternation of students between school and work, and the differential treatment of students based on their reading ability. These and other unique features are discussed in greater detail below.

Instruction. The IHS instructional program consists of basic skills classes (reading, math, language arts, and social studies classes), special interest and special skills classes (courses in photography, street law, silk screening, music, graphic arts, drama), life skills classes (classes in human sexuality, nutrition, drug abuse, and other health-related areas), recreational classes (bowling, karate, swimming, basketball), and work seminar classes. The basic skills classes are held daily in the morning while most other classes are held in the afternoon. Students attend work seminar classes during their two eight-week work semesters.

For instruction in the basic skills, students are divided into two groups on the basis of their reading ability. Team I students, those with lower reading ability, receive much more individual attention than Team II students. The Team I classes are smaller (i.e., never more than 15 students compared with as many as 35 students in Team II), and teachers in these classes are more likely to assist one or two students at a time, rather than work with the entire group. In both teams, teachers use a variety of locally developed and commercial materials, many of which are self-paced and have a workbook or worksheet format. As often as possible, students also participate in cultural, historical, educational, and recreational trips related to their school experiences.

The special interest and Special Skills classes are one way in which the IHS program attempts to fuse academics with careers and to provide courses of interest to the students. The classes are designed to provide training that students find helpful as they make their career choices. The types of classes offered change from one semester to the next based on student interests. Arrangements are made for students to participate elsewhere (e.g., in another alternative school) if a course of interest to them is not offered at IHS.

The work seminar classes, comparable to the CIP's Career Counseling Seminar (CCS) classes, are held weekly during the two eight-week, work-experience sessions. Like the CCS classes, the work seminar classes are a main mechanism by which world-of-work attitudes and behaviors are taught. Students are trained in proper interview behaviors, resume preparation, world-of-work behavior (attitudes and appearances), self-awareness, self-esteem, tax forms, sex discrimination, banking procedures, and career options and occupations. Guest speakers, classroom presentations, films, and trips are an integral part of the work seminar classes.

Social services. As is the case with the CIP, the IHS social services component provides individual counseling, group counseling (primarily through the life skills and work seminar classes), career orientation, legal aid, and family counseling. In both programs home visits and family conferences (at home and at school) are also held both on a regularly scheduled basis and as needed. In both programs this counseling is provided in whatever areas a student needs, including personal and family problems and progress in school.

An integral part of the social services program is its outreach, an element comparable to the CIP's follow-up of program graduates. Information on jobs, the GED test, employment and training programs, health, legal issues, and a variety of referral services are provided to former students, graduates, and even the community at large. Unlike the CIP's formal one year follow-up though, the IHS social services program has no formal mechanism. As graduates come back to the school they inform IHS staff how they are doing and ask for additional advice or help.

Work experience. A distinguishing feature of the IHS, when compared to the CIP, is its work experience component. Like the CIP's Hands-On, the work experience program aims to provide each student with first-hand knowledge about jobs in his or her chosen career field(s). The IHS work experience component, however, is more elaborate than the CIP's Hands-On. While Hands-On places students on a job site for a week or two (without pay) the IHS work experience program places students in paying public or private sector jobs related to their career choices for eight weeks at a time. This work experience provides students with skills in such jobs as construction, trades, sales, education, and social services. The students receive pay (from IHS funds) for their work experience, along with academic credit.

Throughout the work experience, the students' performances are monitored and evaluated by the IHS job developer and the employers. The IHS students receive direct supervision and training from employers on a daily basis throughout the two eight-week sessions, and during the summer months when the students work for half a day and attend school the other half.

Student assessment. Students receive formal assessments of their current status and progress in the program at the middle and end of each of the four IHS sessions, much the same as the CIP's middle and end of semester assessments. Like the CIP interns, the IHS students are also formally assessed upon entry into the program to assist in developing individual learning programs to plan and determine their career interests so jobs can be matched with their choices. Informal assessment of the students occurs during meetings between the job developers, counselors, and teachers held as needed. These latter meetings are comparable to the CIP's disposition conferences attended by all staff so that a complete assessment of the intern is provided.

Three features of the IHS assessment program distinguish it from the CIP's. The first is that written evaluations are provided instead of grades. Second, the student's assessment involves not only the instructors, counselors, and job developers, but also the student's employers. Finally, an integral part of the assessment is the graduation plan. Not only must students demonstrate that the minimum credit, coursework, attendance, and work experience requirements have been met, but they must also show that concrete plans have been made for post-graduation schooling or employment.

The requirements for graduation in the CIP are that students meet the minimum number of credit, course, Hands-On, and attendance criteria.

Climate. Consonant with the IHS "whole person" approach is the philosophy that students must experience a secure and unpressured learning environment if learning is to be rewarding and exciting. Thus staff at IHS are addressed by their first names, and the groupings are kept small so that students consistently receive special attention and positive reinforcement. There is no dress code, and students are encouraged to get involved in such decision-making activities as selecting and evaluating courses, and serving on course-credit committees.

These latter climate elements of the IHS are unlike those of the CIP's, where a dress code is enforced, where students are rarely allowed to call staff by their first names, and where students are rarely involved in program decision-making. Even so, the IHS program closely approximates the balance between firmness and caring that also characterizes the CIP. Students are held accountable for such behaviors as tardiness, truancy, and missed assignments in both programs. They are also encouraged to express themselves, to be individuals, and to be committed to their work.

Personnel

The organizational structure of the IHS program is quite similar to the CIP's. The numbers and kinds of personnel required, the staff's qualifications, and the roles they play in the program are also quite similar. Along the dimensions of staff activities and duties, however, differences exist between the two.

The IHS program staff consists of 28 members--22 full-time and six part-time personnel. This staffing pattern provides the program with low student-teacher and student-counselor ratios that are comparable to the CIP's 15 pupils to every teacher and 35 students to every counselor.

The IHS staffing includes a director, instructional, vocational-education, and social-services supervisors, instructors, instructional aides, job developers, social workers, and support staff (including a business manager).

Like the CIP, the IHS program seeks out staff who are motivated and caring, and who can serve as role models for the students. This latter qualification implies that they should be young, able to command respect, and similar in ethnicity to the students. The majority of the staff hold bachelors degrees (78%), are between the ages of 23 and 30 (83%), and are Black (54%).

The qualifications and roles of the IHS director are quite similar to those of the CIP director. Like the CIP director, he or she is expected to hold an MA degree and have administrative experience (three years rather than five, however). He or she bears primary responsibility for monitoring all phases of the school program. In performing these functions the IHS director has somewhat more flexibility than the CIP director, particularly with respect to such activities as hiring staff, accrediting courses, and establishing graduation requirements. As an independent school without any LEA linkages, the IHS director is not required to hire union staff or to receive course approval from the LEA. Also, the IHS director can hire staff members who do not meet LEA certification requirements, but who have "quality" experience (e.g., prior experience with disadvantaged and alienated youths). The IHS director is also not beholden to a "parent" organization such as the local OIC. This relationship, while beneficial in most respects, did limit the CIPs' directors' autonomy and, in some instances, was counterproductive.

The qualifications of the IHS supervisors are not as high as those specified for the CIP supervisory staff. The four years of teaching experience, MA degree, and certification in two subject areas required of the CIP's instructional supervisor, for example, far exceed the minimum of a BA degree and one year of administrative experience specified for the IHS's instructional supervisor. Similarly, the three years of administrative experience required of the CIP's career counseling supervisor (whose role is subsumed in the IHS by two persons who also have other responsibilities) far exceed those of the IHS social services and vocational education supervisors, who need only one year of administrative experience. Despite this apparent difference in qualifications, the responsibilities of the two staffs are highly similar.

As in the CIP, the IHS instructional supervisor is charged with maintaining cooperative working relationships among staff members, managing the instructional staff, and assisting teachers. The IHS supervisor is also charged with such tasks as research, development of materials, and master teaching which, in the CIP, are tasks undertaken by the curriculum resource specialist.

The tasks of the social services and the vocational education supervisors are similar to the CIP's career counseling supervisor's. In addition to managing their respective departments, both supervisors must also maintain cooperative working relationships among staff members. The vocational education supervisor is also charged with managing the placement of students in part-time public- and private-sector jobs throughout the year, a responsibility similar to managing obtaining Hands-On placements in the CIP.

Unlike the CIP's criteria of two-to-three years experience in a related field, IHS basic skills instructors, social workers, and job developers are required to have only one year of experience in a youth-oriented program. The special skills instructors need only a high school diploma and experience teaching a special skill and working with youth. The roles and responsibilities of these staff are quite similar, however, to the CIP's instructors, counselors, and job developers. In addition to teaching youth with diverse skills, instructors must also develop and maintain positive relations with students and other staff, and provide extra remedial help to students when needed. Social workers manage a caseload of 20 to 35 students and provide personal, academic, and career counseling, as do the CIP counselors. Unlike the CIP counselors, however, IHS social workers do not have responsibility for recruiting students. Job developers arrange part-time jobs for students, monitoring their progress on the job, and acquaint students with the standard procedures and protocol associated with seeking employment, duties similar to the CIP's career developers' role in arranging Hands-Ons.

The IHS fiscal manager takes on those fiscal responsibilities that would be handled by the CIP's director as well as those performed by the local OIC. He or she handles not only financial records and purchase orders, but also assists the director in organization and coordination of office procedures.

Recruitment

The IHS program has a waiting list of over 100 eligible applicants. The major sources of referrals (approximately 50%) have been such social service agencies as the Division of Youth and Family Services. Some referrals have also come from counselors, social workers, and principals at the senior and junior high schools all over the city of Newark. Other applicants have been friends and relatives of current and former IHS students. Finally, some students have simply walked in.

Unlike the CIP, the IHS has not had to spend a great deal of effort designing and implementing recruitment strategies. Perhaps the main reason for this difference is that the program has existed for over eight years and has become well known in its city and community. Another reason may be that the IHS has not had to depend as heavily on the LEA for its referrals, as has the CIP. The majority of the referrals, in fact, have come from city and county welfare boards, police and juvenile justice committees, probation departments, and the courts.

Students referred to the IHS must be between 14 and 20 years of age, residents of Newark, and from low-income families. Once referred to the IHS they are interviewed by counselors who determine if the school program can effectively meet their needs. Students must then obtain transcripts, undergo a medical examination, and obtain a social security card. Before acceptance, students are given a one- to four-week orientation to the IHS (the CIP's orientation lasts for one week) before being placed into the instructional program.

Facilities

Like the CIP, the IHS has office space for all its approximately 10 non-teaching staff members, and a classroom for each instructor. There is also a reading laboratory, a dark room, and a woodworking shop. Also, like the CIP, it has lunch room facilities, does not have its own recreational facilities, and must make use of such community resources as the boys club and YM-YWCA.

Funds

The IHS budget, unlike the CIP's, is administered by the director and the fiscal manager, restricted only by contractual limitations imposed by the funding agencies. The availability of funds for the program has been a continuing problem, however, and some program activities such as the work experience component have occasionally been blocked by a lack of financial resources. Similar problems were experienced, at times, in the CIP demonstration.

A problem experienced yearly by the IHS is the issue of refunding. Unlike the CIP during the demonstration period, the IHS depends upon multiple agencies for funding. During the 1977-78 year, for example, it received funds from nine agencies including the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency and the Youth and Family Services Division.

Relations with the Local Education Agency

Since its inception, the IHS program has operated nearly independently of the LEA (though in recent years relationships have begun to grow). While a closer affiliation would be desirable, there are a number of disincentives, including lack of enthusiasm within the LEA for programs developed outside the system, pressures from the local teachers' union, and the absence of a legal mechanism that allows the allocation of state educational funds to private, non-profit schools (Yourish, 1980). These barriers are not unlike those experienced by the CIP demonstration sites.

The steps taken by the IHS to improve relationships have included regular meetings with the Executive Superintendent of Schools, the County Superintendent of Schools, and other representatives of the schools to attempt to convince them of the value of the program and to seek monies for the future. These meetings have not succeeded in obtaining funding. More importantly, the IHS has never succeeded in convincing the LEA to grant academic credit for courses taken at the IHS by students who subsequently returned to the regular high schools. On the other hand, student referrals from counselors, social workers, and vice-principals have increased.

Relations with the Community

The placement of students in non-subsidized and subsidized jobs depends on strong positive relationships with the private and public sectors. Like the CIP, the IHS makes use of a community advisory board (called the Governing Board) to link the program to the community. Just as the CIP, which had to depend upon the community for placement of students in Hands-On experiences, the IHS found that developing positive relations with the community was not an easy task. Both programs found many employers initially resistant because of prior negative experiences with other subsidized OJT programs. According to IHS staff members, significant factors related to the program's success in placing students are the frequent job-site visits, supervision, and follow-up provided by the job developers. For the CIPs, monitoring of the Hands-On is also an important factor related to the placement of students, but site supervision is not provided directly by the CIP staff.

Analyses of the IHS Evaluation Outcomes

Measures of effectiveness reported in the IHS 1978-79 and 1979-80 evaluations included enrollment, attendance, retention, graduation, and placement statistics. The program enrolled 110 and 107 students respectively for the two years. Attendance figures were reported at 79% or better in-school, in-class, and at the work sites. For the 1978-79 year, IHS was able to retain 75% of its students (retention data were not reported for the 1979-80 school term). The program graduated 16 students during the two-year period, all of whom were placed in college, in jobs, or in an OJT program.

Enrollment

The enrollment objectives for the IHS program during the 1978-79 and 1979-80 school years were to admit 80 to 100 dropout and potential dropout students between the age of 14 and 21, all of whom were Newark residents. With this number of participants--half assigned to work, and half attending classes--the IHS is operating at full capacity.

The IHS was able to meet its enrollment objectives without any difficulty. Several factors appear to be relevant to this attainment. First, the IHS receives referrals from all of its funding sources (which at one time amounted to as many as 10 agencies). Thus the program does not depend upon the willingness and efficiency of a few schools to provide referrals (as was the case for the CIP), or upon zealous recruiting activities by members of the program's staff. Second, the enrollment of students in the IHS program is a rather uncomplicated process and does not entail either testing or formal review of transcripts to determine if students meet the age, minimum income, and residence requirements. The referral agencies for the IHS conduct the preliminary screening and refer students only if the minimum requirements are met. Other factors include:

- enrollment in the program takes place four times during each school year, thus allowing new students to fill the slots of students who dropped out of the program or were terminated;
- the program has operated in the community for over seven years and has a well established reputation;
- the program's catchment area encompasses the entire city of Newark; and
- there are only a few competing alternative school programs.

The nature of the CIP demonstration and evaluation requirements prevented it from having several of the enrollment-facilitating features of the IHS. The demonstration did show, however, that as catchment areas were expanded and as the CIP became better known in the community, recruiting difficulties were markedly reduced. If the sites receive adequate continuation funding, it is RMC's opinion that the recruitment task would be reduced to manageable proportions and that the programs could obtain enough students to operate at full capacity.

Attendance

The attendance objectives of the IHS were to maintain in-school, class, and work-program attendance of 80%. For both years (1978-79 and 1979-80), including the summer months, the IHS program was able to meet its in-school and work-program attendance objectives. In-class attendance fell slightly short of the 80% criteria for the 1978-79 school term (it was 79%), but reached 82% the following year. For both years, attendance was higher in the work program (91% and 90% for the two school years) than in-class or in-school attendance. Attendance did not decline during the summer months, very possibly because of the work stipend.

Several factors appear related to the high attendance rate, particularly that of the work-program. First, according to the IHS evaluation report (Yourish, 1979), students who participate in work activities have been found to exhibit a higher degree of motivation and responsibility than those who do not. Another factor may be that students are frequently visited on the job site and are provided with follow-up support.

Another related factor is thought to be the structured but very informal school atmosphere that is encouraging and supportive, yet demanding. One facet of this atmosphere, furthermore, is directly related to attendance. Students not at school within the first half hour are called at home and are urged to come. Transportation subsidies are provided for those who are in need of it. Similar activities were called for in the CIP model--and probably would have raised attendance rates--but were never fully implemented because the time that normally would have been available for them was consumed by the more pressing need to recruit students.

As mentioned above, unlike the CIP, IHS attendance did not decline during the summer. This difference between programs is attributed to the fact that, during the summer months, students work for half of the day and attend classes the other half. To be paid, however, they must attend both the work program and the IHS classes. In the CIP, a primary reason for the decline in summer school attendance was thought to be the interns' need for summer employment. The opinion was frequently voiced by CIP staff members that some sort of work program was needed to hold students during the summer. In line with this recommendation, the linkage of pay to both school and work attendance would appear to be a useful policy for the improvement of summer school attendance.

Retention

The IHS program does not have a clear-cut policy toward terminating students. In general, every effort is made to keep students enrolled including, at the discretion of the staff, placing students on leaves of absence for pregnancies or other personal crises.

The 1978-79 evaluation report indicates that the school retained 83 (75%) of its 110 enrollees. (Retention data were not reported for the 107 enrollees of the 1979-80 school years.) The majority of the retained youth had not dropped out of school but had accumulated fewer than 15 of the 92 credits needed for graduation (58%). The program was able to maintain more in-school youth than out-of-school youth, though a significant number of former dropouts were retained (during the 1978-79 year IHS retained 35 (60%) out of 58 former dropouts).

The most frequently cited reasons for termination reported by the IHS administration were: administrative separation (30%) for truancy, tardiness, unexcused absences, transfers to a GED program (17%), and employment (17%). This rank ordering was similar to that observed at the CIP sites where attendance was stated as the primary reason for student terminations followed second by employment, followed by family care and returns to the high school. Unlike the CIP, however, an unanticipated outcome of the program was the voluntary termination of five students because they needed and were offered (as a consequence of their participation in the work program) full-time unsubsidized employment. Since one of the goals of the IHS program is to provide career-related employment opportunities for students, the five terminations were viewed as positive program outcomes. Similarly, the placement of students who were 20 years or older and found it difficult to attend school, into GED programs was also viewed as a positive type of termination. As indicated, five (17%) students terminated to attend GED programs.

Graduation

To receive a high school diploma from IHS, students must not only meet the credit and attendance requirements, they must also meet the program's standard of "readiness" for the world outside of IHS. Specifically, they must have made concrete plans for entering employment, college, an on-the-job training program, or the military. This requirement is consonant with the aim of the program not only to teach students the skills necessary to obtain meaningful employment, but to motivate them to fulfill their career potential as well.

During the 1978-79 and 1979-80 school years, the program was able to graduate 16 (10%) of its 155 students; 8 students each year. This number of graduations was lower, at least for the 1978-79 year, than was projected based on the number of entry credits and the maximum number of credits students could have earned. Of the 19 students that could have graduated, 8 (42%) did so during the 1978-79 year. Two of the remaining potential graduates completed their schooling about one and one-half years later. Four students remained in the program and had not graduated as of June, 1980. Three others reached the age of 21 and were encouraged to enter a GED program, which all three did. Only two of the potential graduates terminated: one because of poor attendance and the other because his family moved away. With respect to attrition, these findings suggest that the IHS had a strong "holding power." On the other hand, the program does not graduate students nearly as rapidly as would be expected on the basis of their entry credits. Several factors appear related to this situation.

One factor related to the finding that the IHS program needs a longer amount of time to graduate students than expected (a finding that was also observed in at least two CIP sites--Sites B and C) is the extent to which the IHS program provides a caring environment for its students. In the IHS, like in the CIP, the staff are dedicated--as is evidenced by the enormous amount of uncompensated time they spend with students on program tasks beyond their already long working hours (Yourish, 1979, p. 15). Though they are firm, staff do not give up on the students. This caring attitude must make it difficult for students to break away from the "family" relationships to which they have grown accustomed. Several CIP interns mentioned a similar reluctance to depart from the program.

One obvious reason for delayed graduation is that simply completing attendance and credit requirements is not enough. IHS graduates students only if they have made concrete plans for their post-high-school careers. Of 13 students for whom June, 1980 graduations were planned, 9 failed to meet that date because applications to college had not been sent out, SAT's had not been taken, employment had not been sought, resumes had not been completed, and similar reasons. Other students failed to graduate on schedule because of lateness to school, absences, and not enough credits, although these reasons were almost always combined with indecisiveness regarding post-IHS plans. Thus, meeting the program's standard of "readiness" for graduation appears difficult for many students. Without that criterion it seems likely that a larger number of students would have been graduated. It is not clear, however, that the IHS would be able to meet its placement goals without withholding the diploma until post-graduation plans were finalized.

Placement

The ultimate goal of the IHS program is to prepare all of its students to continue their education or find jobs related to their career interests. Placement in a full-time job, college, an OJT program, the military, or some other career training program designed to enhance their career goals is a prerequisite for graduation.

Of the 16 students graduated during the 1978-79 and 1979-80 school years, 8 chose to enter college, 5 others entered full-time employment, and the remaining 3 enrolled in OJT programs. Those who entered college or OJT programs had plans for such careers as computer technology, dental hygiene, electrical engineering, and home economy. Those who chose full-time employment entered such careers as retail sales, marketing, and public service.

Two factors appear related to the IHS program's success in the placement of all its students: its graduation policy and its provision of student work experiences related to their careers. Like the CIP, the IHS staff members assist students in selecting colleges, preparing resumes, completing financial aid forms, and in other ways intended to help them meet the graduation placement requirement. At the CIP, the intentions are similar, but the IHS sanction of withholding the diploma until concrete plans are made appears to force students to take actions they might otherwise put off.

COMPARISON 4:

KENSINGTON-EDISON YOUTH PROGRAM
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Program Overview

The Kensington-Edison Youth Program (KEY) is an LEA-operated alternative school for economically disadvantaged youth between the ages of 15 and 21 who have had trouble learning in the traditional school environment. The program is a cooperative effort between two high schools--Kensington and Edison--that are attempting to reduce the high rate of dropping out. The major goals of the KEY program are to help dropouts and potential dropouts earn high school diplomas and to assist them in obtaining meaningful employment in career fields of their choice. The program provides basic academic skills improvement, counseling, skills training, and placement. It is divided into three areas: academic instruction, counseling, and career preparation. Every week students alternate between the KEY center and the Randolph Skills Center which provides the career preparation component of the program. The KEY program operates during the regular school year only.

The instructional program is individualized for each student, but small- and large-group instructional activities also occur. Students take courses in the basic subject areas (reading, math, English, science, and American history) as well as elective courses (parenting education, human biology, urban environment, and ecology). Class sizes are kept small (12-20 students per class) and personalized learning is emphasized. The KEY program includes both individual and group counseling on personal and academic matters. Students are initially interviewed by the KEY staff to determine their academic and career objectives. Informal sessions are held throughout the year to address the students' personal concerns, including school adjustment problems. The guidance counselors at the skills center and those at the students' home schools also provide counseling services to students as needed.

The career preparation component consists of career counseling, skills training in two or more related skills, and job placement assistance. The program is designed to provide students with job-specific entry-level skills, experiences in a variety of career fields, and proper attitudes toward work. Students receive skills training in seven clusters: communications, construction, health services, manufacturing and maintenance, personal services, power mechanics, and warehousing. They also receive intensive career counseling to help them make realistic career decisions.

The KEY 1978-79 and 1979-80 evaluations reported data about the program's success in enrollment, attendance, retention, and graduation. The program was able to operate at full capacity during the two-year period and enrolled 160 students. Retention data from the

1979-80 year showed that of 80 students, 64 (80%) remained in the program. Of these 64 students, 15 (23%) graduated. School attendance for the two years was reported at 68% and 76% respectively. Attendance was reported as "improved" for more than half the students.

Analysis of KEY Components

The goals of both the KEY program and the CIP are to enable disadvantaged, potential dropout students to earn their high school diplomas and to help them obtain employment relevant to their career interests. The two programs offer academic courses, counseling, and career education. One important difference between them, however, is that the KEY program provides students with job-specific entry-level skills training, whereas the CIP provides students with two two-week Hands-On experiences designed not to teach entry-level skills but rather to give an overview of the work in two career fields. Also, the KEY program is an LEA-operated program whereas the CIP is a CBO operated, community-based program requiring strong linkages with the LEA. These and other features of the KEY project are described in detail below.

Context

The KEY program is an outgrowth of the Penn Treaty-Edison Project, a dropout prevention program funded in 1971 under Title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. That program's goals were to reduce the dropout rate and develop career awareness in youth. It originally operated as a separate career education project for the all-boys Edison High School but was expanded a year later to include the all-girls Kensington High School career education component. These two separate boys and girls components were consolidated into the KEY program in 1976 to make the program coeducational.

The KEY program operates as an annex to the Edison and Kensington High Schools. It is located off-site in a renovated house in Kensington, a factory district two miles northeast of downtown Philadelphia. The area is the last of Philadelphia's low-income white areas. Like the areas where the CIPs are located, it is affected by a high crime rate and high dropout rate (Edison High School has the highest dropout rate of all the schools in Philadelphia).

Students

The 160 students who attended KEY during the 1978-79 and 1979-80 years were potential dropouts between the ages of 15 and 21. The students were drawn from Kensington Girls High School and Edison Boys High School in approximately equal numbers. Approximately half were dropouts who had been out of school for at least a year and half were potential dropouts. The racial composition of the students was 60% white, 20% Black, and 20% Hispanic. Like the CIP interns, many of the KEY students were poor attenders and low achievers.

Program Treatment

The KEY program has a number of features which distinguish it from the CIP. For example, it offers students skills training whereas the CIP offers two two-week Hands-On career exposure experiences. Also, the KEY program provides less group counseling than the CIP.

The following description provides the details of the KEY program in comparison to the CIP. The description is organized according to the three major KEY program areas listed earlier (instructional, counseling, and career preparation), plus two supporting areas (climate and assessment).

Instruction. The KEY instructional program, like the CIP's, provides students with a personalized atmosphere. Both programs offer individual instruction, small class sizes, a variety of materials that appeal to the students' interests, and basic skills remediation. Also, in both programs, the math classes are completely individualized. KEY students, however, are assigned semi-programmed materials while the CIP interns work with learning packets. In the reading classes, students in both programs work on self-paced individualized materials like the Sullivan Adult Reading Series which are selected because of their high interest level. However, in other classes, such as American history, science, English, and social studies, the instruction is more traditional. The lecture approach is used along with small- and large-group activities and students work more with textbook and workbook materials. They are also assigned individual projects such as book reports and journal writing, and participate in open discussions and role-playing activities. The only class using learning packets similar in format to the CIP's is the parenting education class which is offered as an elective. Field trips related to the students coursework are an integral part of the KEY instructional program as they are in the CIP.

Two distinguishing features of the KEY instructional program are its back-to-basics orientation in instruction and its somewhat traditional teaching format. Careers are not incorporated into the academic courses as they are in the CIP. With the exception of some discussion of careers in the parenting course, world-of-work attitudes are not fused into the academic courses. They are discussed, however, in the career preparation courses provided by the Randolph Skills Center. In addition, the KEY curriculum does not include classes in which students get the opportunity to voice their career-related concerns as they do in the CIP's Career Counseling Seminars. For the most part, KEY students remain in their "home" classrooms where they receive instruction in reading, math, and social studies.

Career Preparation. A distinguishing feature of the KEY program is its skills center component. Students alternate between the Randolph Skills Center and the KEY center every week. They are encouraged to develop job-specific entry-level competency in two or more skills. Such training, of course, has a different focus than the CIP's Hands-On experience, where students spend up to two weeks each at two job sites. The Randolph Skills Center offers career awareness, career guidance, career involvement, and job placement assistance. A major objective of the center is to train students for entry-level job placement.

The Randolph Skills Center offers seven occupational clusters (groups of related trades) to which students are assigned according to their interests and proclivities. Students are generally assigned to one cluster, but they are free to explore all the occupational areas in that cluster. For example, placement in the Personal Services cluster would allow students to explore the areas of cosmetology, food preparation and service, child development, care of the elderly, hotel work, and law enforcement. Placement in the Construction cluster would allow exploration of the careers of carpenter, plumber, electrician, mason, building superintendent, paper hanger, painter, and decorator.

In addition to exposure to careers through the occupational clusters, students attend job preparation classes where proper attitudes toward the world of work are developed. They are taught the importance of regular attendance and punctuality, how to follow directions, and how to be responsible in completing assigned tasks. These classes are comparable to the CIP's daily CCS classes. However, the job preparation classes are not team taught by counselors and instructors, as are the CCS classes.

The career guidance aspect of the skills center is comparable to the CIP's career development planning activity where interns lay out their career goals and become acquainted with options and opportunities available for employment and continuing education. Prior to entry into the program, the KEY student and his or her parents meet with the assistant program coordinator to discuss the program and the student's career interests. During the student's stay at KEY, periodic meetings are scheduled with the Skills Center staff to counsel each student in his or her chosen career area. The student is also provided quarterly accounts of his or her progress. The expectation is that upon completion of the program, the student will receive a certificate listing the various skills he or she has mastered.

Job placement is a final aspect of the career preparation component of the KEY project. As part of the Skills Center offerings, senior-year students who are interested in a cooperative work program are placed in part-time jobs. One important feature of the Randolph Skills Center is that it also helps students to meet the requirements for apprenticeship programs.

Counseling. Students in the KEY program receive individual and group counseling on an informal basis as do the CIP interns. Unlike the CIP students, however, who are assigned to full-time CIP counselors, the KEY students are counseled by their respective home-high-school counselors. Also, during their sessions at the Randolph Skills Center, the KEY students receive both career guidance and placement services.

An important distinction between the KEY program's counseling and that of the CIP is its intensiveness. While both programs provide comparable job preparation counseling, the CIP's individual personal and academic counseling and its group counseling are more intensive. As mentioned, interns in the CIP are scheduled for individual biweekly conferences with their counselors. Individual conferences for the KEY students are scheduled only upon the student's initiation and more often than not, during a crisis. Also, there are no daily scheduled group counseling sessions in the KEY program as there are in the CIP (CCS).

A feature of the KEY counseling program that is similar to that of the CIP is the involvement of the KEY staff in conferences where each student's progress is reviewed. During weekly meetings, KEY staff review each student's progress and get a consensus from the group on additional activities or ways any problems are to be solved. These weekly conferences are like the CIP's disposition conferences.

Assessment

Students in the KEY program are assessed daily on an informal basis and receive formal assessments four times a year, as do the CIP interns. Also in both programs, the students are assessed upon entry to determine their reading and math skill levels so the necessary remedial assistance can be provided. They also receive formal assessments at the Skills Center four times a year to coincide with their KEY progress reports.

As is the case in the CIP, the students' formal assessments consist of graded progress reports. The assessments, especially those provided by the Skills Center, are based upon student academic performance and attendance. One distinguishing feature of the KEY project, however, is that students are also issued quarterly Activity Progress Report which lists the tasks the student has started and/or completed during the quarter.

Climate. The KEY climate is quite similar to that of the CIP. In both programs, the staff are concerned about the whole student, including both academic and personal problems. The staff also try to provide an atmosphere that is caring, supportive, rewarding, and unpressured, but that also encourages student responsibility. Both programs have small class sizes which allow for a more personalized and individualized atmosphere. Students are praised for good work and are given much encouragement. The staff in both programs also show the students that they care through such behaviors as calling students at home when they are absent from school and disciplining students for misbehaviors. In the KEY program, the staff even visit the students at the Skills Center to see how they are doing and to provide assistance with problems they may have. This is not unlike the CIP where staff members are expected to visit the students during their Hands-On experiences.

As in the case of the CIP, the KEY students are held accountable for such behaviors as tardiness, attendance, smoking, using drugs, fighting, and breaking the dress code rules. The accountability system used in the KEY program is much stricter, however. For example, letters are sent to the parents/guardians of those KEY students who are absent three times. After six absences, a parent interview is required to determine whether the student should continue in the program. Sanctions for poor attendance were generally more lenient in the CIP demonstration sites.

Personnel

The KEY program staff includes a part-time program coordinator, a full-time assistant program coordinator, six full-time certified teachers, and one full-time administrative assistant. This staffing pattern provides student-teacher ratios that are comparable to the CIP's 15 pupils to every teacher. The roles that these staff members play in the program are quite similar to those of the CIP's staff.

The most important criteriom used to select the staff is commitment to helping youth. Like the CIP, the program also seeks staff who are caring and motivated and who are able to command respect. With the exception of the administrative assistant, all of the staff hold bachelor's or master's degrees and are certified in at least one area. The typical staff member has between 15 and 20 years teaching and/or administrative experience, compared to the CIP where the majority of the staff have fewer than 10 years experience.

The KEY program is jointly administered by the program manager and assistant program manager. The program manager spends half time at the KEY and half time administering two other district alternative programs. He or she is responsible for monitoring all phases of the KEY program and serves as a liaison between the program and the district offices. This includes serving as liaison between KEY and the Skills Center staff and lobbying for KEY funds.

The assistant program manager is responsible for the internal KEY program operations. He or she supervises the staff, administers the budget, arranges students schedules, and in general manages the overall operation of the program. The assistant program manager also teaches, counsels students, develops curriculum, conducts the intake, and assists the program manager in such tasks as representing the project at school board and local meetings.

Many of the tasks performed by the program manager and assistant program manager are like those performed by the CIP's director. Similarly, the relationship that exists between the two KEY managers is like that which exists between the CIP's director and its local OIC. Just as the assistant program manager depends upon the program manager to sponsor the program, build support for it, and act as an intermediary between the program and the school board, the CIP director depends upon its local OIC for these functions.

The KEY program-manager and assistant-program-manager job descriptions call for more qualifications than the CIP director's. While the CIP director is expected to have a master's degree and a minimum of two years experience, the KEY's assistant program manager is expected to have these qualifications plus certification in at least two subject-matter areas. The program manager is expected to have the equivalent of a master's degree in administration, and five years administrative experience.

As mentioned above, the assistant program manager is expected to teach, counsel, develop curriculum, and handle intake. These tasks are comparable to those of the CIP's instructional supervisor, teachers, and counselors. A distinction, however, is that these responsibilities do not require as much in-depth involvement in the KEY program. For example, intake into the KEY program only requires an interview with the student and his or her parents and the completion of certain release forms. Students are initially assessed by their classroom teachers. In the CIP, intake entails not only an interview but also achievement testing, initiation of a career development plan, and an assessment of the number of credits required for graduation. It should also be noted that the assistant program manager does not have regularly assigned classes as do the CIP teachers. Finally, counseling is done on an informal basis and during crisis occasions rather than on a biweekly basis, as is the case with the CIP.

One important difference between the KEY program managers and the CIP directors is the amount of autonomy each has. Both programs operate as independent high schools. The directors thus have similar amounts of autonomy in such activities as hiring staff and awarding academic credit. The KEY program managers, however, must accept teachers from the LEA based on seniority and have little control over teacher selection. The CIP directors can only hire staff members who meet LEA certification requirements. The directors/managers of both programs also must obtain course approval from the feeder schools.

Teachers in both programs are responsible for the students' entire instructional program. They counsel students on an informal basis and develop and maintain positive relationships with students and other staff. Unlike the CIP instructors, the KEY teachers are not expected to make home visits (although they are expected to meet with parents to discuss the students progress), nor are they expected to coordinate their instructional activities with other teachers to the extent that is specified for the CIP.

The qualifications of the KEY teaching staff are similar to those of the CIP teachers. In both programs, the teachers are expected to be certified or certifiable. Previous alternative-school experience is also desired by both programs. One distinction between the teachers in the two programs, however, is that teachers in the CIP are selected because they can serve as role models for the youths. Thus, CIP teachers are young, able to command respect, and ethnically similar to the interns. Because of their union affiliations, KEY program staff cannot be selected for these characteristics.

Recruitment

Approximately half the students referred to the KEY program are dropouts and half are potential dropouts. Most of the program's referrals (approximately 75%) come from current or former KEY students. Referrals also come from counseling and administrative staff members at the two high schools. The third source of referrals is lists of dropouts received from the Kensington and Edison High Schools and from community persons. Approximately 10% of the students are recruited through dropout lists. An additional 15% are recruited through the high schools' staff referrals.

Intake into the KEY program occurs from September through January until the program has acquired 80 students. To enter the program students must be between the ages of 15 and 21, must be dropouts or potential dropouts, and must be residents of the Kensington-Edison attendance area.

Facilities

The KEY project has office space for its program manager and assistant program manager and for each of its six teaching staff members. It does not have lunch room facilities, since the students are dismissed from school at 1:30 each day. To conduct its recreational program, the KEY program, like the CIP, must make use of the community resources. Recreational activities take place at a nearby community playground.

Funds

Unlike the CIP's budget, which is administered by the director in conjunction with the local OIC, the KEY budget is administered by the assistant program manager who is restricted only by the budget limitations imposed by the school district's general fund. Material orders are also handled directly by the assistant program manager who solicits the teachers' needs for new books, equipment, and other materials each year. Supplies for the project are received from the Kensington and Edison High Schools. The program manager handles requests for and receipts of these supplies.

Except for the KEY project's first year of funding, which was provided by Title VIII federal monies, the project has received money from the school district's general fund. The program manager must lobby for funds each year since the district has 32 such alternative programs.

Relations with the Local Education Agency

The KEY program is an annex to the Kensington and Edison High Schools and, as such, must coordinate its activities with these two schools. Like the CIP, the KEY program depends upon the high schools for student referrals, and for the award of course credit towards graduation. Like the CIP, KEY students receive diplomas from the feeder schools rather than from the program itself. KEY students are also referred back to their respective high schools for counseling services as needed. Both programs receive in-kind support such as student food services (breakfast for KEY students and lunch for CIP students) and transportation services. The KEY program is also dependent on its feeder schools for office supplies.

In addition to coordinating its activities with the Kensington and Edison High Schools, the KEY staff must maintain close relationships with the Randolph Skills Center staff and school board personnel. The KEY program is dependent upon the Skills Center primarily for student scheduling, maintaining student records, and for monitoring the students progress. Weekly visits are made to the Skills Center to assist students with problems and to let them know that the project staff are interested in their performance.

Relations with the Community

The placement of KEY graduates is dependent upon strong positive relationships with the business community. For this reason, the Skills Center advisory board includes community and business persons. The staff at the KEY program also attend community meetings to share details about the KEY program with interested persons. Contacts are also made with community resource persons who are able to provide such ancillary services as family counseling and legal services.

Parent involvement is an integral part of both the KEY program and the CIP. In the two programs, parents are invited in for open house events and discussions on the student's progress. Both programs also contact parents when students are absent. In the KEY program, however, parents are contacted daily until the student returns to school.

Analysis of the KEY Program Evaluation Outcomes

The 1978-79 and 1979-80 KEY evaluation reports included measures of effectiveness in enrollment, attendance, retention, and graduation. The program enrolled 80 students each year. Of the 80 students enrolled during the 1979-80 year, 64 (80%) remained in the program. Fifteen of the 64 earned their high school diplomas. Attendance was reported at 68% and 76% for the two years respectively. Attendance improvement was noted for more than 50% of the students in each of the two years.

Enrollment

The KEY enrollment objectives for the 1978-79 and 1979-80 school years were to admit 80 students between the ages of 15 and 21 who were all residents of the Kensington-Edison attendance area. With this number of students the program would be operating at full capacity. The program met this enrollment objective both years. Also, each year it had a waiting list of over 20 eligible students.

Several factors are thought to be related to the KEY program's ability to meet its enrollment objectives. First, the project is an annex to the Kensington and Edison schools which have very high dropout rates. The program staff estimated that over 500 youths had dropped out from these schools, a sizeable pool of students from which to recruit.

A second related factor is the visibility of the KEY program in the community. According to KEY staff more than 75% of the enrollees were referred to the program by current or former KEY students. Also, the KEY program evolved from a former dropout prevention program, the Penn Treaty-Edison Program, which had existed for five years. The long-standing reputation of this program in the Kensington community and KEY's incorporation of many of the Penn Treaty-Edison components have helped to establish KEY in the community.

The KEY program is able to maintain a substantial list of eligible candidates but has experienced difficulty in keeping the candidates interested in the program. One reason is that the waiting period for entry into the program is anywhere from six months to a year. In that length of time the students find employment or make alternative plans. This experience is similar to that of the CIP where long periods of uncertainty between initial application to the program and ultimate admission to it led many potential students to take alternative courses of action.

Attendance

The attendance objective of the KEY program for the two-year period considered here was to improve the attendance of more than 50% of the participants. It exceeded that standard in both years. Of the 61 and 51 students for whom attendance data were reported, 43 (70%) and 37 (73%) respectively improved their attendance while attendance remained the same for 21 of the remaining 32 students. The average daily attendance rate for the two years was 68% and 76%.

Two factors are thought to be related to the KEY program's success in meeting its attendance objective. One factor is the caring attitudes that the KEY staff portray through activities such as following up on absent students daily, and visiting them at the Skills Center to provide support and to assist them with any problems they may have. It was expected that the CIP staff would provide a similar daily follow-up on students who were absent. Unfortunately, time constraints and the priority given to other tasks, such as recruiting, prevented them from consistently conducting such activities.

The second factor thought to be related to the KEY program's high attendance is the firm policy of its Skills Center regarding unexcused absences. Parents or guardians of students who are absent three times receive letters reminding them of the school's policy. The parents are called in for an interview after six absences, at which time a decision is made as to whether or not the student is benefitting from the program and whether or not his or her participation should continue. Students terminated from the Skills Center for poor attendance are simultaneously terminated from the KEY project.

Retention

The KEY termination policy, like that of the CIP, is designed to keep students in the program for as long as is possible. For example, although students are automatically suspended (for a few days) for such misbehaviors as smoking, using drugs, or carrying weapons, they are allowed to return to school after a conference has been held with their parents. Also, while poor attendance at the Skills Center is a cause for dismissal, poor attendance at the KEY center does not generally result in the termination of the student. The only sanction that poor attendance carries is the possibility of course failure, although students in the KEY program are not failed if they complete the required work. This latter policy is different from the CIP's policy where 70% attendance is a requirement for passing a course.

The KEY program retained 64 (80%) of the 80 students enrolled during the 1979-80 year. The majority of these students were second- and third-year participants.

One factor thought to be related to the KEY program's high retention rate is its early dismissal hour (students are dismissed at 1:30 p.m.) which allows students to hold part-time jobs while attending school. Although the most frequently cited reason for the KEY program terminations was to accept employment, fewer students left for this reason than was expected. (It was estimated that over half the KEY students needed work while attending school.) There was a similar need for part-time jobs among the CIP students. The longer school day, however, made finding suitable employment substantially more difficult. This is thought to be a major factor contributing to the CIP's lower retention rate.

Other factors thought related to the KEY program's ability to retain a high proportion of students are:

- the caring attitude shown by staff who call students when they are absent and who provide students with a lot of individual attention; and
- the absence of rigid termination policies that make it possible for students to pass coursework on the basis of their accomplishment of the work rather than on the basis of attendance.

Graduation

The KEY program's requirements for obtaining a regular high school diploma are that students complete the required number of courses in the required content areas. Since the program is not accelerated, students may take as long as three years to earn their diplomas.

The goal of the KEY program is to graduate at least 50% of the eligible students. During the 1979-80 year, 16 students had achieved twelfth-grade status. Of these 16 students, 15 (94%) graduated. Twelve (80%) of these graduates were enrolled for more than two years before completing the KEY program. Their average age at graduation was 18.6.

COMPARISON 5:

URBAN LEAGUE STREET ACADEMY
New Orleans, Louisiana

Program Overview

The Urban League Street Academy (ULSA) is a community-based alternative high school for economically disadvantaged persons aged 16-60, virtually all of whom have been out of school for a year or longer. Approximately 80% of the students are between the ages of 16 and 21. The program is operated by the Urban League of Greater New Orleans, but receives extensive in-kind support from the New Orleans Parish School Board. The primary objectives of the ULSA program are to enable students to earn a GED and an ULSA diploma, and to assist them in obtaining meaningful employment. (Note: the ULSA diploma is not equivalent to a high school diploma or a GED. It is a certificate of completion. To obtain that certificate, however, students must have demonstrated reading, math, and language proficiency at the 10th grade level on a standardized achievement test.)

The program is divided into three basic areas: instruction, career education, and counseling. Students receive instruction in basic academics, individual and group counseling, career awareness experiences, stipends, job referrals, and day-care services. The regular school year is divided into five nine-week sessions (called quinmesters) and students attend classes for half a day only. They participate in counseling activities in the afternoon if they choose.

The instructional program provides training in basic reading, math, English, science, and social studies. Students are grouped into classes of no more than 20 per teacher. Throughout the half day they rotate from one class to another just as in a traditional high school. They participate in individual, small group, and large group activities. The core materials used are GED materials, textbooks, and reference books. Reading, English, and math classes are held in the communications appreciation laboratory. The core curriculum for these classes consists of individual, self-paced audiovisual materials. In all the classes, mastery learning is emphasized.

The career education program consists of career counseling classes, career day seminars, and job readiness activities that help students make the transition to the world of work. Students selected for the Urban League's Career Awareness Education Program (CAEP) attend classes in career communications, career math, and career counseling in addition to their regular basic skills classes. These students also participate in two or three on-site work experiences where they learn about occupations related to their career interests. The rest of the ULSA students participate in two or three career-day seminars and exhibitions held during the course of the year. They also attend the ULSA career counseling seminar class once a week and receive career counseling from the ULSA counselors and the ULSA Postsecondary Resources Training Center staff. The latter also assist them with college and career reference materials.

The counseling program consists of intake, individual, group, and family counseling, and such supportive services as job referrals and referrals to child care and health care agencies. The students meet regularly with their selected advisors and counselors to discuss personal and academic concerns. Lunch hours, study periods, and after school hours are spent in seminars, rap sessions, or study sessions. These group meetings are designed to facilitate the students' development of high self-esteem and self-confidence.

The ULSA 1978-79 and 1979-80 evaluation reports include data on enrollment, attendance, retention, graduation, and placement. Over the two-year period, the program enrolled 174 students between the ages of 16 and 21. Of the 174 students, 154 (89%) were retained by the program. The program graduated 61 (35%), 22 (36%) of whom earned a GED diploma. Follow-up data reported on the 22 GED graduates indicated that 17 (78%) of them entered either part-time or full-time employment, enlisted in the military, or entered college or an OJT program.

Analysis of ULSA Components

The ULSA and CIP projects have similar goals, serve similar youth, and provide similar services (counseling, career education, academic instruction). The two programs, however, have a number of features which clearly distinguish them from one another. For example, while both programs operate under the auspices of a community-based organization (the Urban League and OIC respectively), only the ULSA gives stipends for attending career-related activities and provides a day care center. The CIP, on the other hand, provides biweekly individual counseling and Hands-On work experiences.

Context and Objectives

The ULSA project was originated by the Urban League of Greater New Orleans to combat the high dropout rate among youth, particularly minority youth, and to enhance their employability by providing an alternative education. At the time of the original funding the dropout rate among local youths was reported at 19.5%, compared with an average of 16% among the nation's 50 largest cities (Glapion, 1978).

A grant to set up the Street Academy was awarded to the Urban League in 1972 by the Office of Economic Opportunity. Subsequent funding came from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA). The ULSA was founded that year in a storefront building. It has grown from 125 to 180 students per year. The program is now located in the heart of New Orleans adjacent to one of the city's largest public housing units.

Students

The 174 youth served by the ULSA program during the 1978-79 and 1979-80 school years were similar to the CIP interns. The students were predominantly Black (99% Black in the ULSA) and between the ages of 16 and 21. (The ULSA program also served students up to age 60, but 80% of its participants were between the ages of 16 and 21.) Approximately 50% of the ULSA students had been involved in minor scrapes with the law.

The ULSA students differed from the CIP interns in one important way. All the ULSA students had been out of high school for at least a year, compared with the CIP where half the interns were dropouts and half were potential dropouts. Only 30% of the ULSA students had completed grade 10, while 50% of the CIP interns had accumulated half of the credits they needed for graduation.

Program Treatment

Students attending the ULSA program proceed through these phases. Phase I--the Street Academy--is like the CIP's Phase I in which students are diagnosed to determine their appropriate placements in English, math, and other subject areas. Unlike the CIP interns, who also participate in Career Counseling Seminar (CCS) classes to learn more about their chosen careers and the world-of-work behaviors during Phase I, the ULSA students undergo a series of group counseling sessions designed to facilitate their development of high self-esteem and positive self-concepts.

In Phase II--the Academy of Transition--the ULSA students continue to develop basic skills in the academic areas, but they also participate in more sophisticated elective and mini-courses rather than remedial courses. Also in Phase II, students engage in pre-vocational activities that include actual work experiences, career seminars, and other world-of-work focused activities. This aspect of Phase II is comparable to the CIP's Phase I Career Counseling Seminar and Phase II Hands-On placements.

The final phase of the ULSA program--the Academy of the Future--is comparable to the CIP's Phase III in which interns complete the coursework required to earn their diplomas and make concrete post-graduation plans. In the ULSA, GED preparation, college preparation, and post-graduate plans are emphasized.

Throughout all three phases of the ULSA program, the staff are concerned with the "whole person," just as the CIP's staff are. The details of the three phases of the ULSA program's treatment are discussed below.

Instruction. The ULSA instructional program consists of basic skills classes (reading, math, English), mini-course classes, and elective classes, many of which are designed to build positive self-images (Black studies, drama, ethnic studies). Students attend each class two or three days of the week and during the mornings only. The classes are generally held for nine weeks. No more than 20 students are assigned to any one class.

Students are administered diagnostic tests upon their entry into the program. On the basis of the test results, they are assigned to ability groups and are scheduled to attend classes in reading, math, and English with their assigned group. The primary method used in these classes is based upon Benjamin Bloom's theory of "Mastery Learning." The students are evaluated on their mastery of the specific skills objectives.

During Phases II and III of the instructional program, students choose at least two elective courses (basic science, ethnic studies, anthropology, foreign language) and at least three mini-courses (arts and crafts, typing, human sexuality, family life, physical education, basic sewing, consumer education, horticulture, sickle cell anemia). The elective courses are held two or three times a week. The weekly mini-courses, which are taught by community resource persons, are designed to match the students' interests.

Students experience a wide variety of activities in their assigned classes. In the reading, English, and math classes which are held in the ULSA communications appreciation laboratory, students work primarily with individual, self-paced audio-visual materials, including filmstrip projectors, calculators, record players, tape recorders, video cassette tapes, and video tape cameras. In the elective and mini-courses they participate in small and large group activities, seminars, field trips, panel discussions, and projects. In Phase II of the program, many of the activities are team taught and are centered around such units of study as man and his culture, man and communications, and man and his economics. Once a week, the students participate in cultural, historical, educational or recreational trips related to their school experiences. During Phase III, the core materials used are GED materials.

Many of the courses and activities in the ULSA's instructional program are similar to those in the CIP. In the case of the CIP, however, the instructional program is more individualized (through the use of learning packets) and is "fused" with a career focus.

Career Education. The ULSA career education program is organized into two parts. Approximately 35 students are selected (on the basis of good attendance) to participate in the Urban League's

Career Education Awareness Program (CAEP). The rest of the students participate in the ULSA career education program.

In the CAEP, students participate in career communications, career math, and career counseling classes which are held once or twice a week. They participate in mock job interview sessions and learn to use the daily newspaper classified ads, employment agencies, and personal contacts to find jobs. The students also take field visits to nearby businesses and participate in two or three job-site observations related to their chosen careers. These latter job-site observations are comparable to the CIP's Hands-On experiences. Students in the ULSA spend as much as a week at each of two or three job sites to learn more about the job. They are paid stipends provided by the CAEP funds (based upon their attendance at the job observation sites and in other CAEP activities), while the CIP interns are not paid for their Hands-On experiences.

Students participating in the ULSA career education program attend a job preparation course where they learn such world-of-work activities as completing job applications, resume preparation, interview behaviors, and world-of-work attitudes. In addition, they participate in two career-day seminars where they can hold mock interviews with local businessmen, professionals, and skilled laborers in careers of interest to them. Job seminar sessions are also held throughout the year. At these sessions community persons describe the local job market and advise students on the training needed for various careers.

The ULSA Business Studies Program (BSP) is an integral part of the career education program. The BSP classes are offered to all students who are interested in clerical jobs. Courses are offered in basic typing, shorthand, business communications, and records management. Business Studies Certificates are awarded to students completing the program and the Urban League Placement Office helps them locate jobs. The CIP does not offer such a program, although it does provide typing classes.

The career education classes held in the CAEP and ULSA are comparable to the CIP's CCS classes, although the ULSA classes are held less often and have more of a counseling than a career-knowledge focus. In both programs, guest speakers, films, and trips are integral parts of the career classes and seminars.

Counseling. The ULSA counseling program consists of intake, and individual, group, and family counseling sessions; social services; and outreach activities. As in the CIP, intake consists of diagnostic testing and program orientation. In the two programs students are given diagnostic tests upon entry so decisions can be made regarding their class and course assignments. Also in both programs, students are scheduled for an initial individual counseling session where they discuss both personal and academic problems and their career goals. In the CIP, however, students are scheduled for subsequent individual counseling on a biweekly basis rather than as needed and/or desired, as in the ULSA program.

In both the ULSA and the CIP, group counseling sessions are held where students participate in role playing, rap sessions, seminars, and problem solving activities. One distinction between the two programs, however, is the ULSA's more explicit emphasis on the development of high self-esteem and self-confidence. In the ULSA, Phase I of the counseling program is devoted almost entirely to improving the students' self-concept and self-confidence. Students are assigned to interaction groups consisting of no more than 10 persons. In those groups, self-disclosure activities, directed and open discussion, motivational dialogues, games, films, slides, tapes, and other materials and techniques designed to improve human relations, self-concepts, and self-confidence are used.

The ULSA social services and outreach programs are quite similar to those of the CIP. In both programs students are assisted in obtaining employment, entering college, or entering an OJT program. The two programs make extensive use of their community based organizations to place students in OJT programs. They also refer students to legal and health care agencies when needed, and represent students in court.

One important difference between the ULSA and CIP programs is that the ULSA students receive day care services free of charge, whereas the CIP interns do not receive such services. As is discussed below under LEA regulations, these services are provided by the LEA and are designed to encourage higher attendance among students with young children. For several CIP sites, a lack of child care service was cited as having prevented students from attending the program. In fact, for three CIP sites, child care was the third most frequently cited reason (out of 10 given responses) for dropping out of the CIP.

Student assessment. Student assessment in the ULSA program is an ongoing process, as it is in the CIP. In both programs, there are also specific points at which students receive formal assessments. In the ULSA program, students are formally assessed at the end of each quinmester (nine-week period) while in the CIP, formal assessments occur at the middle and end of each semester. In both programs, the students are also assessed at the time of entry, primarily to determine their academic needs.

Informal assessment of ULSA students occurs not only in the classrooms, but also during the weekly staff meetings held with counselors and instructors. These meetings are comparable to the CIP's weekly disposition conferences where all staff members participate in discussions regarding each student's progress in the program.

The ULSA assessment program differs from that of the CIP in that it uses written evaluations rather than grades and has a "no failure" policy. Unlike the CIP, the program is not required to meet LEA course credit requirements since it is a GED program. Therefore, it attempts to build student self-confidence and encourages them to attain their full potential without the threat of a grading system.

ULSA climate. The philosophy of the ULSA program is that a positive sense of self-worth has a "favorable influence upon one's ability to function in the learning environment" (Glapion, 1978). Interpersonal relations between students and teachers are stressed as an essential factor in building the student's self-esteem. Individual and group counseling sessions which provide individual positive reinforcement and encouragement are held frequently, where peer tutoring and peer support is also encouraged, as is the development of individual responsibility and accountability.

The ULSA's climate is similar to that of the CIP. In both programs, the staff members try to provide a supportive, rewarding, and unpressured atmosphere. Rap sessions, seminars, field trips, and similar activities are held to encourage greater interaction between teachers and students and among students themselves. Also, since both programs emphasize the "whole person" concept, teachers and counselors deal with the student's personal concerns as well as academic and career concerns.

Finally, both the ULSA and CIP encourage student responsibility and are firm with students. Students are held accountable for their course of study and for pursuing their career choice plans. Neither program allows students to wear hats in school and both discourage students from addressing staff members by their first names. In the CIP program, however, students are sanctioned for violations of the dress code, whereas in the ULSA program, they are not.

Personnel

A major distinction between the ULSA program and the CIP is that the former is a GED preparation program and the latter is a high-school-diploma-awarding program. Since GED preparation requires only about five months compared to the one and a half or two years most students need to complete a regular high school diploma, student turnover is higher at the ULSA than at the CIP. Also, a smaller staff can operate the ULSA than the CIP since there are fewer students on-site at any given time. Thus, the ULSA program does not need full-time counseling and instructional supervisors nor does it hire a full-time curriculum resource specialist. Since the Urban League's CAEP staff take responsibility for placing students in work experiences, the ULSA program also has no requirement for a job developer.

The ULSA staff consists of 14 full-time personnel compared to the CIP's 22. The program employs a director, a coordinator of student affairs/counselor (comparable to the CIP's director designee and counseling supervisor), eight teachers (two each in reading, math, and English, and one each in science and social studies), two counselors, and two administrative staff members. With this staffing pattern the ULSA class sizes and student-counselor ratios are kept small (no more than 20 students per teacher and approximately 35 students per counselor).

The major criteria used to select the ULSA staff are a genuine concern for people and a commitment to helping youth. These are also important considerations in hiring CIP staff. Thus, both programs hire personnel who are motivated and caring. Unlike the CIP, however, the ULSA does not purposefully seek out staff who can serve as role models for the students. The present ULSA staff as described by the director is "a melting pot of persons of different races, religions, backgrounds, ages, philosophies, and ambitions" (Glapion, 1979).

Like the CIP's director, the ULSA director is expected to have a master's degree and several years experience in the administration and supervision of educational programs. In both programs the directors must possess strong leadership qualities. They are responsible for all phases of the program's operation, including the maintenance of linkages with the LEA and community organizations. Also, both directors report to their parent organizations (The Urban League and OIC respectively). The ULSA director has more autonomy than the CIP director, particularly in the hiring of staff and establishing graduation requirements.

The ULSA coordinator of student affairs/counselor assists the director, supervises the counselors, counsels students, and maintains contact with neighboring schools, the LEA, and with community organizations and agencies. As mentioned, this position combines the roles of the CIP's counseling supervisor and director designee positions. The qualifications required of the ULSA coordinator of student affairs/counselor are not as high, however, as those specified for the CIP supervisors. Instead of four years teaching, a master's degree, and three years administrative experience, the ULSA coordinator/counselor is only required to have a master's degree in counseling. This person must also be willing, like the CIP's supervisors and designee, to work beyond normal expectations (Glapion, 1979).

The tasks of the ULSA instructors are quite similar to those of the CIP's instructors. In both programs, the instructors are responsible for the students' entire instructional program and for counseling students (on an informal basis) on personal, social, educational, and emotional problems. In addition to teaching students in their major discipline, instructors in both programs must also teach in other areas as the need arises (especially for substitute teaching). In the case of the ULSA teachers, the expectation [illegible] that they plan and conduct at least one mini-course (e.g., courses in consumer education, horticulture, human growth and development, everyday law) in an area that is not necessarily their major discipline.

Although the tasks of the ULSA and CIP instructors are highly similar, their required qualifications are not. The two programs require that the instructional staff be willing to work beyond the normal expectations and be genuinely devoted to helping youth. But, college degrees and certification are not required for the ULSA program (although they are preferred) as they are for the CIP. In the CIP demonstration, certification qualifications were temporarily waived for several of the instructional staff having other qualifications, but eventually everyone had to meet the LEA certification requirements.

Counselors in the ULSA program perform tasks that are quite similar to those performed by the CIP counselors. In both programs, for example, the counselors are responsible for recruitment, intake, home visits, student referrals to social service agencies, record keeping, and serving as liaison to the community. The two programs also require that counselors interact with teachers. One distinction between the two programs is that the ULSA counselors do not participate in team teaching activities while the CIP counselors team teach the CCS classes with the instructors. Another distinction is that ULSA counselors are not required to conduct extensive individual counseling related to the student's career planning or personal needs. On the other hand, the ULSA counselors do conduct extensive group counseling sessions, particularly group sessions designed to enhance the students' self-confidence and self-concepts. These group counseling sessions are somewhat similar to the CIP's CCS classes, but their focus is more on building self-esteem than on preparing students for the world of work.

The ULSA counselors are required to have only a high school or equivalency diploma, quite unlike the CIP's requirement of a bachelor's degree and two to three years counseling experience. The ULSA program also requires that counselors have an interest in education and the school community, previous contact with minority students, and the ability to communicate with parents.

Recruitment

The ULSA program maintains a waiting list of over 400 eligible applicants for the approximately 180 slots it has each year. The majority of referrals (approximately 80%) have come from former and current participants in the program. A few referrals (approximately 2% to 5%) have come from the two high schools in the area. Other referrals have come as a result of the ULSA program's publicity activities which have been quite extensive. Both the ULSA and the CIP have used brochures, newsletters, newspaper ads, television, radio spots, and presentations before community groups to recruit program participants. Unlike the CIP, however, the ULSA has also involved its Advisory Committee members on radio talk shows, much to its benefit.

Intake into the ULSA usually occurs in the fall, but as students earn their GEDs, ULSA diplomas, or terminate, new students are enrolled in the program. The CIP had no comparable mechanism for replacing departed students. Students entered the program in cohorts at times determined by the demonstration schedule.

Both CIP and ULSA applicants undergo a screening process to determine which of them can be admitted to the program. Both programs required that students read at a minimum competency level (fifth-grade level minus one standard error of measurement for the CIP and fourth-grade level for the ULSA) as measured by a standardized achievement test. Applicants also had to be at least 16 years old and local residents. Upon acceptance into the program, the ULSA students, like the CIP interns, are given a one-week orientation.

Facilities

The ULSA project occupies three floors of the Scottish Rite Temple building in which it is located. Like the CIP, it has office space for its director and administrative staff. Eight classrooms, a communications appreciation laboratory, and counseling offices for each counselor are located on one floor. A second floor contains the day care center and an eating area. A third floor of the facility houses the two CAEP classes.

Funds

Since its inception, the ULSA program has had to complete for funds each year. The project was originally funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity. The loss of these funds forced the ULSA to close briefly in 1973-74 (Glapion, 1978). Since then, with the exception of the 1979-80 year, most of the funds have been provided through an ESAA grant. The ULSA program has also received funds and/or in-kind support from the local Urban League chapter (e.g., for its CAEP), the LEA, and from such agencies as the State Department of Health and Human Resources (for inservice teacher training, student seminars, and such special youth projects as setting up an urban community garden).

As was the case at the CIP, periodic funding uncertainties caused staff concern over whether the program would continue to operate and whether program services would have to be cut back or halted (Glapion, 1978). However, the ULSA program did not experience staff turnover because of the funding difficulties. One factor thought to be related to the program's success in holding staff is their commitment to the Street Academy concept. This commitment to the ideals of the program is similar to the commitment of CIP staff members, but the CIP situation was confounded by the demonstration nature of the program.

Relations with the Local Education Agency

During its first few years of operation, the ULSA program operated with only the good will of the LEA. In subsequent years, however, the relationship has become more substantive with the LEA providing four of the ULSA's eight teachers, free lunches and transportation for eligible students, a Title I Homestart program to encourage students with young children to attend school, the use of its equipment and materials, and a budget allotment based upon student enrollment (Glapion, 1979). The ULSA and LEA have membership on each other's ESAA Advisory Councils and participate in the district's Continuing Education Program for the qualifications of ULSA GED eligible students. Another important linkage with the LEA is the ULSA staff's participation in the LEA's ESAA program for new members. These kinds of linkages with the LEA have not yet evolved in the CIP, perhaps because of the CIP's newness in its communities.

Several factors are thought to be related to the closeness of the relationship between the ULSA and its LEA. First, as just mentioned, the ULSA program is a GED preparation program and unlike the CIP, does not offer a regular high school diploma. This status places the ULSA in a situation where it is not competing with the regular high school for the same students. Also, it does not need to follow LEA staffing guidelines nor does it have to get permission to recruit and authorization to grant course credits.

A second factor thought to be related to the mutually supportive and cooperative relationship between the ULSA and LEA is the fact that the LEA is able to keep students on its rolls who are actually being served by the ULSA. This arrangement provides a substantial financial incentive to the LEA. Although the CIP operated in a similar fashion, it was some time before the LEAs began to understand the benefits that cooperation brought them.

A final factor related to the close relationship between the LEA and the ULSA program is the longstanding reputation of the ULSA's parent organization, the Urban League of Greater New Orleans, in the community. The ULSA was dependent upon and made use of its affiliation with the Urban League in its negotiations with the school board. Many of its accomplishments would not have been realized in the absence of the Urban League's prior linkages with the community and the school board. The CIPs were similarly dependent on their affiliations with the local OICs.

Relations with the Community

Positive relations with the community are essential to the ULSA's success in placing CAEP students in work experiences exposing them to available career options. Staff members of both the ULSA and CIP programs maintain a list of cooperating agencies and resource persons whom they can call upon to provide either job-sites or classroom speakers. As was planned in the CIP demonstration, the

ULSA uses the resources of its advisory panel members and involves parents in its program activities to the greatest extent possible. For example, parents and members of the business community are used as resource persons for the career-day seminars, rap sessions, and workshops. One of the highlights of the ULSA's parent involvement program is the lunch hour sessions held frequently with counselors, parents, spouses of participants, and the students. The ULSA staff members are given the opportunity to discuss student attitudes and progress and to familiarize family members with the aims and operations of the ULSA. The ULSA parents and the community are also kept informed of the program's activities through a monthly newsletter. In the ULSA project, the staff includes three neighborhood residents, while a host of community volunteers are involved in project activities (Glapion, 1979).

Analysis of the ULSA Evaluation Outcomes

Data on the attendance, enrollment, retention, graduation, and placement of ULSA participants were reported for two years, 1978-79 and 1979-80. The program enrolled 91 and 105 students respectively. It was able to retain 53 (58%) and 84 (80%) of the students who enrolled. Attendance ranged between 50% and 80%, but these figures are misleadingly low because substantial numbers of inactive students were kept on the ULSA's rolls until they were officially terminated by the LEA. The program graduated 31 students the first year, 10 of whom earned their GEDs. During the 1979-80 school year, 30 students graduated, 12 of whom were awarded GEDs. Of the 22 students earning a GED, 16 (73%) were placed in full-time employment, college, or OJT programs.

Enrollment

The enrollment objective of the ULSA program was to enroll 180 students each year. Of these 180 students, 144 (80%) were to be between the ages of 16 and 21. With this number of participants, the program would have operated at its full capacity. Funding limitations, however, curtailed the number of students who could be served. For the two years covered by this analysis, the ULSA program was able to enroll as many students as it could afford to serve. It received monies for 85 16-21 year old enrollees in 1978-79 and 105 16-21 year old students in the 1979-80 year. Of the 91 students enrolled in the 1978-79 program, 22 re-entered for the 1979-80 year along with 83 new enrollees (a total of 105 enrollees for the year). Thus, over the two-year period, the program enrolled 174 youth between the ages of 16 and 21.

Several factors appear to be related to the ULSA program's enrollment success. First, the ULSA program has an elaborate recruitment program that ranges from on-the-street canvassing (in the earlier years of the program this procedure was used quite extensively) to local newspaper, radio, and television announcements, and to talk shows. Second, there are few alternative schools in the area and consequently there is little or no competition for students. A third factor is that there is a large dropout population from which to draw participants (the 1977-78 New Orleans School District survey on dropouts reported a total of 2,437 dropouts; the program could only accommodate 85 participants that year). A fourth factor thought to be related to the ULSA's ability to recruit sufficient numbers of students is its attractiveness as a GED preparation program in which the average length of stay is shorter than the time needed to earn a regular high school diploma. Fifth, the ULSA program offers its own diploma which is particularly useful for admittance to local trade and vocational schools. To earn that diploma, students need to attain a 10.0 grade level or better on a standardized achievement test. A final factor is that the program had operated in the community for over six years (by 1978-79) and has a well-established reputation, particularly as regards its affiliation with the Urban League.

It is RMC's opinion that if all of these factors had existed in the CIP demonstration, the recruitment task would have been much easier. As it was, the CIPs collectively had only the benefit of the last factor, the affiliation with their local community-based organizations. Given the time factors of the CIP demonstration, the many negotiations that had to take place, and various other constraints, the CIP's affiliation with the local OIC was not enough to overcome the negative forces that were at work.

Attendance

The ULSA's attendance objective is to maintain 70% or better attendance. During the two-year period its attendance ranged between 50% and 80% (as it did at several of the CIPs). (It should be noted that the figures are excessively low because of the fact that inactive students are included in the attendance calculations.)

Several factors appear related to these attendance rates. First, the absence of a strong attendance policy is thought to be important. Like several of the CIPs, the ULSA program does not terminate students for what would normally be considered poor attendance. It uses the LEA criterion of 20 consecutive days of unexcused absence prior to terminating a student. In general, students are contacted by their counselors after approximately five days. If, within the following 10 days, the student has not returned to school, a follow-up call is made or postcard is sent. In some instances, home visits are made. Students returning to school are counseled regarding their poor attendance, but there do not appear to be any strong sanctions.

A second and closely related factor is the absence of any ties between graduation and attendance (such ties are present in the CIP). Since the ULSA is a GED preparation program, it does not have to meet LEA or state attendance guidelines. Students become eligible for the GED by scoring at the twelfth grade level on a standardized test. In the CIP sites, students are not given credits for courses in which they are enrolled if their attendance is poor.

Retention

The ULSA termination policy is very clear cut. As mentioned, poor attendance is not taken too seriously and does not carry strong sanctions (students are terminated after 20 consecutive days absence). Misconduct, on the other hand, carries sanctions as it does in the CIP. ULSA students are automatically suspended for the entire year for such offenses as drugs and smoking, but the ULSA staff members do seek out other alternative programs for suspended youths. For such offenses as fighting, ULSA students may get a one- or two-week suspension, and as in the CIP, they are likely to be given second chances. Unlike the ULSA students, however, the CIP interns are also given second chances for drug offenses.

The 1978-79 ULSA evaluation report indicates that the program retained 53 (58%) of the 91 students enrolled. The following year the program retained 84 (80%) of the 105 enrollees. Included in both these figures, however, are non-attending students whose names should be dropped after 20 consecutive days absence. The 1978-79 findings indicate that attendance and employment were the two most frequently cited reasons for termination, with equal numbers of students having been terminated for each of the two reasons (24% each). These reasons were also primary reasons for termination at the four CIP sites. Child care, which in two of the CIP sites ranked third among 10 reasons for termination, was not reported in the ULSA as a related factor. The ULSA program does provide child care services for youth who require them, apparently much to its advantage. The CIP does not provide child care services.

Graduation

The primary goal of the ULSA program is to enable students to earn their GEDs. The program also offers its own diploma as an incentive for students to continue in pursuit of their GEDs. It also encourages students for whom earning a GED appears unlikely after their two years stay at the ULSA, to return to the high school to earn a regular diploma. These students are provided credit for courses taken at the ULSA.

To qualify for the GED test, students at the ULSA must score a 12.0 or better grade level on the CAT. Good attendance is not considered a prerequisite for the GED test, although it is encouraged.

To earn a ULSA diploma, students must score a 10.0 or better on the CAT. This diploma does not carry the same weight as the GED, but it is particularly useful for admittance to local trade and vocational schools.

During the 1978-79 and 1979-80 years, 61 students earned a ULSA diploma--30 in the first year and 31 in the second year. This number of students represents 35% of the 174 students enrolled in the program over the two-year period. Of the 61 students, 24 (39%) were qualified to take the GED test. Of the 24 GED qualified students, 22 (92%) earned that diploma. This latter number represents 13% of the total number of students enrolled over the two-year period.

One factor thought to be related to the small number of GED qualified students is the 12.0 grade level criterion established by the county. This criterion is believed by program staff to be higher than what is needed to pass the GED. No efforts have been made to lower the criterion, however, since the county and the ULSA staff want to maintain the credibility of the GED in colleges and universities which accept students on the basis of the GED. By setting a 12.0 criterion, the ULSA and county feel assured that the GED students can succeed in college or in OJT programs.

Placement

The ULSA program assists students in locating job, college, and OJT placements. During the Academy Transition Phase of the program (Phase II) students are taught how to complete job and student loan applications, as are students in the CIP. Also, through the two-week work experiences, student contacts with employers sometimes result in employment opportunities after graduation.

During the two year period 9 (41%) of the 22 GED graduates were placed in full-time jobs, 3 (14%) entered the military, 2 (9%) each entered college and OJT programs. Of the 22 graduates, four (18%) were neither employed nor had plans for further schooling. Two other female students (9%) were married with young children. In all, the program assisted 73% of the students in getting jobs, entering school, the military, or an OJT program. The ULSA program's expectations were to place as many students as it could in jobs, college, and OJT programs. Given that the unemployment rate among youths in the area is 40%, the number of successful placements is considered by the program staff to be a positive outcome.

IV. ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF THE CIP

This chapter summarizes the comparisons made between the CIP and five similar programs serving similar youth. To the extent that differences in program outcomes appear to be related to specific program features, these linkages are discussed. An attempt is also made to suggest changes in the CIP model that might enhance its ability to achieve its objectives. The discussion is organized by outcomes.

Outcome 1: Enrollment

None of the five comparison programs appeared to encounter any significant difficulty in meeting its enrollment quotas. The CIP, on the other hand, had difficulty recruiting students through the first half of the demonstration period.

Perhaps the most significant difference between the CIP and the comparison programs was length of time in operation, which strongly affected their reputations. All five of the comparison programs were well established and mature. They had operated long enough to have become known in their respective communities and had successful track records. None of them was a demonstration project and none assigned any applicants to control groups. The CIP, on the other hand, was new, had no track record, was a short-term demonstration project, and had to deny access to a certain percentage of applicants who were assigned to control groups. The comparison schools thus had good reputations in their communities while the CIP, at least initially, was largely an unknown quantity but with several marks against it.

As time passed, the CIP did acquire a positive image, and recruiting was immensely aided by this development. Other changes (which served to make the CIP more similar to the comparison programs) also helped.

Most of the comparison programs had large pools of dropouts and potential dropouts to draw from. All had more than one feeder school and several of them recruited city-wide. Because of its initial recruiting difficulties, the CIP, too, moved in the direction of expanded catchment areas. As would be expected, when recruiting was extended into additional neighborhoods less difficulty was encountered in meeting enrollment quotas.

Another problem encountered by the CIP was competition from other alternative programs, some of which offered monetary incentives for participation. The five comparison programs did not encounter this type of competition.

A final difference between the CIP and the comparison projects was the scheduling of student intakes. The CIP's intakes were initially out of phase with the regular school system, while the comparison programs all operated on a schedule similar to that of the regular schools. Several of the comparison programs had the additional advantage of an open-entry, open-exit policy whereby individual vacancies could be filled as they occurred.

It seems unlikely that the CIPs' recruiting difficulties would persist were the programs to receive continued funding. One of the sites was able to enroll a very large group for its final cohort and the other three were all able to meet their enrollment objectives. This success appears primarily attributable to the program's enhanced reputation in the community and the expanded catchment areas. Dropping the requirement for control groups would substantially facilitate recruiting efforts as would better training.

Even with what has been learned through the CIP demonstration itself and the comparison between the CIP and other similar programs, it is not clear that large enrollments can be instantly achieved by new programs--especially if they are "tainted" in the eyes of the community and perceived as federal experiments.

Outcome 2: Increasing Student Attendance

Attendance data were available for only four of the five comparison programs. Three of these programs apparently outperformed the CIP in the attendance area. The other program appeared to be about equal to the CIP.

The three projects that were able to maintain high attendance levels all had strong sanctions relating to unexcused absences. It appears that such sanctions represent a strong force serving to raise attendance.

Other factors that appear to contribute to high attendance include paid work experience, half-day school sessions, transportation subsidies, and child care services. In addition, attendance is improved when students absent from school are contacted each day by telephone.

The CIP's inability to meet its attendance objectives was a direct function of the operational difficulties each site experienced. When the program was functioning properly, attendance was good. When implementation difficulties arose, it fell off. Implementation difficulties also tended to detract from the program's climate, thus providing a further disincentive for attending. Another problem was that staff could not follow up on absent students because recruitment took too much of their time. It is RMC's belief that attendance rates would have been higher had the CIP experienced fewer and less frequent implementation problems. The presence of such incentives as day care services, car fare expenses, and half-day school sessions would have also improved the CIP's attendance rate had they been available.

Those comparison programs that included a job training component tended to have better attendance records than those without. Attendance was also higher in the job training sessions than in the academic portions of the same programs. These findings raise the question as to whether the incorporation of a job training component into the CIP would raise attendance. This question is not an easy one to answer. Two problems, however, come quickly to mind. The first concerns the accreditation of skills training activities. One advantage of being an independent school, as is the case of one of the comparison programs, is that the school itself determines the amount of credit to be awarded. A clear disadvantage for the CIP would be that awarding credits for work experience would require the LEAs to modify their curricula to accommodate these non-academic pursuits.

The second problem related to incorporating a skills training component centers on the compatability of such a component with the overall design of the CIP. While the program makes a major effort to "infuse" its academic offerings with career-related content, it does have a primarily academic orientation and many of its graduates go on to college. It is RMC's opinion that the college orientation of the CIP would change to a job placement orientation (as is the case with the comparison programs) and would thus diminish one of the CIP's main strengths.

A final point relevant to attendance concerns summer programs. All programs that operated during the summer (including the CIP) noted lower attendance than during the regular school year. Limiting summer programs to a half-day helps, particularly if students can obtain jobs for the other half-day.

Outcome 3: Retention

Of the four comparison sites reporting retention data, none had specific retention rate objectives, although each had an implicit goal of retaining as many students as possible. On the other hand, the CIP's targeted retention rate (based on the prototype program's retention rate) was 70%.

Retaining students was difficult for both the CIP and the comparison programs. The reported retention rates at the comparison programs ranged from 44% to 85%. Only one CIP site came close to the established 70% criterion. Part of the difficulty the CIP experienced in retaining youth appears to have been the extreme pressure the sites were under to meet enrollment quotas. This pressure led to the enrollment of students who should not have been admitted and who left the program almost instantly.

In the comparison programs it was more difficult to retain out-of-school youth than in-school youth. (Comparable data were not reported for the CIP.) In all the programs, including the CIP, strict termination policies decreased student retention, but attendance rates were improved.

Unfortunately, non-comparable retention data from the CIP sites and the comparison programs make it impossible to draw firm conclusions regarding the advantages of different program features in improving student retention. Seemingly, programs which serve primarily dropout students are at a particular disadvantage since dropouts are more difficult to retain than potential dropouts. While paid work experience and half day sessions would appear to be incentives for retaining dropouts, their effectiveness is marginal. Out-of-school youth appear to have a greater dependency on full-time work than in-school youth.

Programs that are lenient with students and give them second chances to remain in the program as well as programs that follow up on absent students are able to maintain students longer than programs that have different policies. On the other hand, programs that terminate poor attenders do appear to improve attendance. Finally, programs offering part-time paid work may be at a disadvantage since students are often lost to the program because their part-time employment leads to offers of full-time jobs.

Outcome 4: Graduation

Both the CIP and the five comparison programs failed to graduate all the students who could have graduated. At all four CIP sites, there were fewer graduates than expected, and students generally took longer than necessary to graduate.

One of the most important findings of the analysis was that the two GED programs were able to graduate a larger proportion of eligible youths than were regular diploma awarding programs. One advantage of the GED programs is their accelerated nature. Youth can graduate in as little as three months compared to the average of two years that they took to earn regular high school diplomas.

A second advantage of the GED programs is that they are not perceived as threats to the status of the LEA (as was the case of the CIP and the one comparison program operating as an independent school). Since they do not compete by offering regular high school diplomas, the GED programs enjoy positive relationships with their LEAs that may include the acceptance of transfer credits, funds, lunches, transportation, equipment and materials, and even LEA-provided teachers. The CIP sites ultimately established positive relations with their respective LEAs and received similar in-kind support. But initial difficulties with the union and school board delayed the award of academic credit and subsequently graduation. In one CIP site, students were refused credit for CIP coursework already completed. In the case of the two comparison sites offering a regular diploma but operating under the auspices of the LEA, awarding academic credit was not problematic. Seemingly, this kind of institutional arrangement poses no threat to the feeder schools and teacher unions.

A third and final advantage of the GED programs is that attendance and punctuality are not prerequisites for graduation. Failure to meet attendance and punctuality requirements were major reasons for why fewer eligible youths graduated from the CIP and the three comparison programs offering regular diplomas.

Outcome 5: Placement

The placement findings indicate that the CIP has some advantage over the comparison programs in placing students in college. In terms of job placements, however, the comparison programs have the advantage. This finding is not unexpected, given the different placement objectives of the programs. The CIP placed 50% of its graduates in college while three of the four comparison programs had college placement rates of 8%, 9%, and 20%. One other comparison program also placed 50% of its students in college and the fifth comparison program did not report placement data. Job placement statistics show the CIP at 35% and the four reporting comparison programs at 36%, 50%, 55%, and 57%.

The findings suggest that placing students in jobs, college, or OJT programs is dependent upon (a) the kinds of linkages that the program has with college and business persons in the community, (b) the availability of employment in the area, and (c) the orientation of the program and staff. In terms of community linkages, the CIP staff had more contact with colleges than they had with businesses. Also, in three CIP sites, jobs for youths were not generally available. In the case of those comparison sites that provided paid work experience, greater emphasis was placed on curriculum activities and materials that prepared the students for employment. Also, the staff had better linkages with the business sector of the community than with the colleges. The extent to which the full-time placements were linked to the student's part-time jobs is not known, but there are data to suggest that some of the full-time placements were direct outgrowths of the students' prior part-time jobs.

A significant finding among all the programs, including the CIP, is that prior personal contacts appear more important to the placement of students in jobs and colleges that do formal linkages through an Advisory Council. The CIP and two of the comparison programs established Advisory Councils to assist with placements, but personal associations with employers and colleges and the CIPs' associations with their local OICs were seemingly more effective.

Two other implications drawn from the placement findings are important. First, GED programs are as likely to place graduates in jobs as are programs offering regular diplomas. Second, programs run by community-based organizations do not appear to have any advantage over other programs in OJT placements, even though a major objective of their parent organizations is to provide skills training placements. It should be pointed out, however, that the CIP's focus is different than the OIC's. Nevertheless, the kinds of placements that programs make seem to depend on factors other than the types of affiliation they have or the type of diploma they grant.

Summary

The findings of the comparison study suggest a few changes that might improve the CIP's capability to attract students, to improve their attendance and retention, to graduate and place them in jobs, college, or an OJT program. In terms of enrolling students, the CIP as designed has no obvious disadvantages. The findings indicate that success in recruiting depends on a good reputation, a large enough pool of candidates, an intake schedule that is compatible with the regular school schedule, and reasonably stable funding. While the CIP, as implemented in the demonstration effort, failed to meet several of these conditions, the problem did not lie in the program's design. The design could be strengthened, however, by incorporating a requirement to coordinate intake periods with the regular school schedule.

The CIP appeared to be at some disadvantage with respect to student attendance. Programs that offered paid work experience, half-day sessions, child care, and car fare as incentives had fewer problems with maintaining regular year and summer school attendance. Even more important, however, were strong sanctions relative to truancy. It appears that the CIP would be well advised to enforce such sanctions more consistently than was common in the demonstration. One disadvantage the CIP had resulted from implementation difficulties. These difficulties led to frequent inability to provide daily follow-up of absent students and to maintain the caring, supportive climate needed to enhance attendance. Without implementation difficulties of the magnitude experienced in the CIP demonstration, it is highly probable attendance problems would greatly decrease.

No striking advantages or disadvantages were noted for the CIP in terms of improving student retention. Programs serving high proportions of dropouts were at a particular disadvantage in that out-of-school youth were more difficult to retain. If a recommendation were to be made in this area, it would be to screen applicants more closely and to reject high-risk cases. On the other hand, the program makes its greatest contribution when it succeeds in reaching high-risk youth. There needs to be appropriate recognition of the fact that very high retention rates can only be achieved by excessive "creaming" of the applicant crop--certainly an undesirable approach, and one that would contradict the basic thrust of all the programs to serve those most in need.

In terms of graduation, the GED programs appeared to have some advantage. They not only produced more graduates, but they were as successful in placing them in jobs as programs leading to regular high school diplomas. One might hypothesize that the quality of jobs and the growth potential of students who earned regular high school diplomas would exceed that of students who earned GEDs, but such an hypothesis would require more data over a long period to be tested. In any case, none of the comparisons led to any recommendation that might enhance the percentage of CIP students who graduate.

The CIP does appear to have some advantage in placing students in college, but in terms of job placements, the other programs have more success. The placement of graduates in jobs or college, however, depends upon the "school" or "work" orientation of the program and upon corresponding personal contacts site personnel have with the local colleges or businesses. As mentioned, the CIP places more emphasis on post-secondary schooling as an avenue to career development. No significant advantages were found between regular diploma awarding programs and the GED programs in placing students in jobs. Also, CBO-run programs were not found to have any significant advantages over other types of programs in placing graduates into OJT programs.

These summary findings, while supportable by the data RMC has collected, are subject to misinterpretation unless viewed in the light of both the implementation status of the programs and their objectives. The five comparison programs all have existed for several years, the oldest being eight years old. In contrast, the CIPs began operating at the beginning of 1978. Several of the comparison programs were initiated by and are parts of local school systems, whereas the CIP was imported from outside the local communities and was perceived as threatening to some existing agencies. Thus, the comparison programs held initial advantages over the CIPs that probably affected such program characteristics as recruitment and retention. In regard to program goals, the five comparison programs all emphasize direct placement into employment over placement into further training or education. These differences are reflected in outcome statistics, but should not be construed as indicating greater "success." In the final chapter these considerations are brought to bear on the findings.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The primary purpose of this report is to provide details of comparisons that were made between the CIP and five similar programs. The common and unique features of the comparison programs and the CIP are described, as is the process of identifying the five comparison programs. Some causal linkages are drawn between these features and five indicators of success: enrollment, attendance, retention, graduation, and placement. As pointed out, however, the inferences must be regarded as tentative because data from the four CIP sites and the comparison programs are not entirely comparable. The programs are known, for example, to have used different "formulas" for computing attendance and retention rates. Consequently, while differences in program features are readily apparent, it is not possible to link them conclusively to desired outcomes.

Some 500 youth-oriented programs were reviewed and five were selected for comparison to the CIP. In terms of the five indicators of success the comparison programs were found to have some advantages over the CIP, particularly in regard to student attendance and job placement. On the other hand, the CIP appeared to be superior in terms of college placements. All the programs had some difficulty in maintaining high attendance levels, but programs providing such incentives as paid work, child care, and car fare appeared to have somewhat more success in this area. Strong sanctions with respect to unexcused absences appeared to be very effective in promoting good attendance--although at the cost of lowering retention rates.

All the programs also had some difficulty retaining students, but those serving primarily in-school youth had more success than those that had high proportions of dropouts. With respect to graduation, the GED programs appeared to have somewhat more success than programs offering a regular high school diploma. Surprisingly, the CED programs were no less successful than those providing regular high school diplomas in finding job placements for graduates. Those offering diplomas, on the other hand, were more successful in placing graduates in college. Moreover, in light of differences among program goals, the data imply no superiority to any of the programs. They merely highlight their different intents.

The major program features that appear important to the various outcome areas are summarized as follows:

- Features Enhancing Enrollment
  - Location in an area having few competing alternative schools
  - Reputation in the community as a viable, effective alternative program

- Acceptance by regular high schools as a non-competitive and useful entity
  - Coordination with the feeder schools in terms of intake schedules
  - Recruitment from a catchment area large enough to provide an ample pool of potential recruits
  - Accelerated nature of program

- Features Enhancing Attendance
  - Firm attendance policies where attendance is linked to graduation and unexcused absences are grounds for termination
  - Such incentives as paid work experiences, half day school sessions, car fare, and on-site or nearby child care services
  - Caring staff who provide daily follow-up of students absent from school or work

- Features Enhancing Retention
  - Paid work experiences
  - Lax attendance policies
  - A positive, caring program climate

- Features Enhancing Graduation
  - Accelerated nature of program
  - Offering of GED rather than regular high school diploma
  - Operation under the auspices of the LEA

- Features Enhancing Placement of Graduates
  - Personal associations of program staff with colleges, community businesses, and community organizations

With respect to the CIP, RMC's general conclusion is that had it been fully implemented throughout the demonstration period, it would have met and perhaps surpassed the objectives set for it on all five outcomes. Once the CIP established a positive reputation in the community, became perceived as "non-threatening" to the LEA, incorporated more flexible intake procedures, and expanded its catchment area, it was able to meet its enrollment objectives. Also, when it was able to provide summer employment opportunities and daily follow-up of absent students, in-school attendance was improved. While paid work experiences, half-day school sessions, car fare, and child care services might have enhanced its performance in some areas, these features would have increased costs and altered the fundamental nature of the program. On the other hand, less flexibility with respect to unexcused absences might profitably be adopted by the CIP. In any case, it appears that it was the persistent implementation difficulties experienced by the CIP that prevented the program from meeting all of its objectives. With more time, we believe that these difficulties would have been overcome.

The issue of whether incorporating such incentives as paid work experience, child care, car fare, and half day sessions would enhance the CIP's ability to retain students or improve their attendance cannot be resolved here. When the program was able to provide some child care services indirectly through the local social services agencies, attendance did seem to improve. On the other hand, adopting half-day sessions would appear to impair seriously the accelerated nature of the CIP and thus one of the features apparently related to its ability to graduate students. Likewise, the incorporation of paid work experience would appear to alter the career orientation objective of the CIP. It is RMC's opinion that a change from the present career orientation to a work orientation would reduce the CIP's ability to place as many graduates in colleges as it has done to date. Such a change would represent a major departure from the CIP's objectives.

APPENDIX A

DISPOSITION OF NOMINATED PROJECTS

APPENDIX A: DISPOSITION OF NOMINATED PROJECTS

Project Name and Location	Reason for Rejection
Advancing Careers Through Individual Opportunities Now (ACTION) Evergreen AL	Outside Project Scope
Exploration and Preparation in Careers (PIC) (Experience-Based Career Education) Searcy AR	Outside Project Scope
Fort Smith Public Schools Fort Smith AR	No Response
Little Rock Public Schools Little Rock AR	No Response
Pine Bluff Public Schools Pine Bluff AR	No Response
Career Lab Mesa AZ	No Response
Cochise County Career Education Mesa AZ	Outside Project Scope
Extended School Day Program Tucson AZ	No Response
Pima County Developmental Career Guidance Project Tucson AZ	Insufficient Information
Tucson Public Schools Experience-Based Career Education Program Tucson AZ	Outside Project Scope
Career Opportunities Program Compton CA	No Longer Exists
Edison High School Experience-Based Career Education Fresno CA	Outside Project Scope
Executive Intern Program Fremont CA	Outside Project Scope
Far West High School Experience-Based Career Education Oakland CA	Outside Project Scope

Project Name and Location	Reason for Rejection
Pacific Horizons High School Experience-Based Career Education Stockton CA	Outside Project Scope
Sture Larrson Continuation School Stockton CA	Outside Project Scope
Youth Career Action Program San Jose CA	No Longer Exists
PUSH for Excellence Program Los Angeles CA	Outside Project Scope
Denver Public Schools Projects Denver CO	No Response
Exploring Careers in the Community (ECC) Lakewood CO	Outside Project Scope
Career Education Project K through 14 Bridgeport CT	Insufficient Information
Center for Vocational Arts Program Norfolk CT	No Response
Community School Program West Hartford CT	No Response
Experience-Based Career Education Portland High School Portland CT	Outside Project Scope
Harding High School Experience-Based Career Education Bridgeport CT	No Longer Exists
Project Option Newark DE	Outside Project Scope
Project REAL (Experience-Based Career Education) Wilmington DE	Outside Project Scope
Boward County Schools Project Fort Lauderdale FL	No Response
Duval County Schools Project Jacksonville FL	No Response

Project Name and Location	Reason for Rejection
E.D. Beggs Vocation and Career Center Pensacola FL	No Response
John E. Ford Career Education Center Jacksonville FL	Outside Project Scope
Community Based Vocational Education (Experience-Based Career Education) Brunswick GA	Outside Project Scope
Skills Education Program Operating Engineers Union Local #13 Agana, Guam	No Response
Project Holomua Hilo HI	Outside Project Scope
Community Career Experiences Idaho Falls ID	Outside Project Scope
Career Education Program Boise ID	Insufficient Information
Pocatello School District #25 Pocatello ID	Outside Project Scope
Decatur School District Experience-Based Career Education Decatur IL	Outside Project Scope
Joliet Township High School District #204 Experience-Based Career Education Joliet IL	Outside Project Scope
Ombudsman Educational Services LTD, Mundelein IL	Outside Project Scope
Sycamore Community Schools Experience-Based Career Education Sycamore IL	Outside Project Scope
Career Development Program Fort Dodge IA	Outside Project Scope
The Community School: A Pathway to Success Elkhart IN	No Response

Project Name and Location	Reason for Rejection
Extension School Program Lawrence KS	No Response
Project EPIC Louisville KY	Outside Project Scope
Exemplary In-School Youth Demonstration Project (Project Operation) Somerset KY	No Longer Exists
Dropout Prevention Enrichment Audio-Visual and Business Machine Modules Opelusas LA	Outside Project Scope
East Baton Rouge School Board Project Baton Rouge LA	No Response
Job Placement Center New Orleans LA	Outside Project Scope
St. Charles Parish Experience-Based Career Education Luling LA	Outside Project Scope
Urban League Street Academy New Orleans LA	Selected
Adult Experience-Based Career Education Augusta ME	Insufficient Information
Androscoggin Comprehensive Training Experience-Based Career Education Program Lewiston ME	Outside Project Scope
Cumberland Center Experience-Based Career Education Program Cumberland ME	Outside Project Scope
H.O.M.E. Learning Center Oreland ME	Outside Project Scope
Appalacian Maryland Experience-Based Career Education Cresaptown MD	Outside Project Scope
Harbor City Learning Program Experience-Based Career Education Baltimore MD	Selected

Project Name and Location	Reason for Rejection
Career Education Experience Wayne MI	Outside Project Scope
Experience-Based Career Education Beacher MI	Outside Project Scope
Walkabout East Lansing MI	Outside Project Scope
Continuing Learning Center Gulfport MS	Outside Project Scope
Harrison County Adjustment School Gulfport MS	No Response
Hattiesburg Municipal Separate School District Hattiesburg MS	No Response
Schools Optional Service Program McComb MS	No Response
Project for Alternative Learning Helena MT	Outside Project Scope
World of Work--Vocational Exploration Program Helena MT	No Response
Alternative Education Berlin NH	Outside Project Scope
Berlin Alternative School Berlin NH	Outside Project Scope
Hanover Alternative School Hanover NH	No Response
Project Second Start Concord NH	No Response
Rochester Alternative School Rochester NH	Outside Project Scope
Experience-Based Career Education Sewell NJ	Outside Project Scope
Independence High School Newark, NJ	Selected

Project Name and Location	Reason for Rejection
Las Cruces Alternative High School Las Cruces NM	Outside Project Scope
Auxiliary Services Student Program Brooklyn NY	Outside Project Scope
Students Helped on Academic Route to Employment (Project SHARE) Middletown NY	Outside Project Scope
Career Internship Program West Nyack NY	Outside Project Scope
Project Learning Experiences Advancement Program (LEAP) New York NY	Outside Project Scope
Santa Fe Alternative High School Santa Fe NM	No Response
Career Education Plus: Planning, Learning Understanding (Experience-Based Career Education) Minot ND	Outside Project Scope
Woodrow Wilson Community School Fargo ND	Outside Project Scope
Career Development Plan Akron OH	Outside Project Scope
Ben Franklin Street Academy Cleveland OH	No Longer Exists
Oklahoma City Adult Day Care Center Oklahoma City OK	No Response
Margaret Hudson Program Tulsa OK	Outside Project Scope
Street School Tulsa OK	Outside Project Scope
Community Experiences for Career Education Project (CE_2) Tigard OR	Outside Project Scope
Portland Interagency Program Portland OR	Outside Project Scope

Project Name and Location	Reason for Rejection
Projects, Inc. Portland OR	Outside Project Scope
Academy for Career Education Philadelphia PA	Outside Project Scope
Alternative Education Project Pittsburgh PA	Outside Project Scope
Alternatives for Dropout Prevention, Phase II Johnstown PA	Outside Project Scope
Alternative Evening Program King of Prussia PA	Outside Project Scope
Alternative Learning Centers Allentown PA	Outside Project Scope
Better Education Through Service and Training Philadelphia PA	Outside Project Scope
BLAST Intermediate Unit #17 Williamsport PA	Outside Project Scope
Bishop Learning Center Philadelphia PA	Outside Project Scope
Dropout Prevention and Retention Program York PA	Outside Project Scope
Edison Project Dropout Prevention Center Philadelphia PA	Outside Project Scope
Electrical Academy of Edison High School Philadelphia PA	Outside Project Scope
Harrisburg School District Experience-Based Career Education Harrisburg PA	Insufficient Information
Intermediate School Dropout Prevention Program Columbia PA	Outside Project Scope
John F. Kennedy Vocational Center (Building Experience-Based Career Education) Philadelphia PA	Insufficient Information

Project Name and Location	Reason for Rejection
Parkway School Philadelphia PA	Insufficient Information
Kensington-Edison-Youth Program (KEY) Philadelphia PA	Selected
Special Services to Disruptive Students Williamsport PA	Outside Project Scope
Suspension Tutorial Assistance Program (STAP) York Springs PA	Outside Project Scope
Urban Career Education Center Philadelphia PA	No Longer Exists
West Chester Area School District Alternative Program West Chester PA	Outside Project Scope
Westinghouse High School Dropout Prevention English and Mathematics Laboratory Pittsburgh PA	Outside Project Scope
Centros de Educacion Y Trabajo Hato Rey, Puerto Rico	No Response
Alternative School of Beaufort County (Sunrise High School) Beaufort SC	Outside Project Scope
Cherokee High School Project Gaffney SC	No Response
Pathfinder Project Watertown SD	Outside Project Scope
Career Planning Academy Forth Worth TX	Outside Project Scope
Education Service Center Region 20 Experience-Based Career San Antonio TX	Outside Project Scope
Occupational and Continuing Education Houston TX	No Response

Project Name and Location	Reason for Rejection
Vocational Education Project Corpus Christi TX	No Response
Alternative Learning Center Experience-Based Career Education Westover WV	Selected
Experience-Based Career Education Charleston WV	Outside Project Scope
Reuther Alternative High School Kenosha WI	No Response
Program for Alternatives in Career Education (Project PACE) Milwaulkee WI	Outside Project Scope
Webster County High School Upper Glade WV	No Response
Wood County Schools WV	No Longer Exists

APPENDIX B

PROBLEMS IN THE MEASUREMENT OF PROGRAM OUTCOMES

The following discussion provides the details of the various problems encountered by RMC in its analysis of the outcome data for the four CIP sites and the five comparison programs. The analysis employed five outcomes--enrollment, attendance, retention, graduates, and placement of graduates. With the exception of placement of graduates, different indices were used to measure quite similar outcomes, making it untenable for RMC to carry out comparisons using the reported statistics. In all instances, RMC tried to obtain raw data and recompute indexes on a common ground. Unfortunately, the raw data could rarely be obtained, particularly in the attendance and retention areas. The problems associated with the four outcomes are summarized below.

Enrollment

Two aspects of the enrollment data made it difficult to draw firm conclusions. First, what was meant by enrollment apparently varied from program to program. Although it was not entirely clear, it appeared that, for several programs, enrollment was defined as the number of students enrolled in the program at the time of admission. Since attrition is high during the first few days or even weeks of program operations, this kind of information is likely to be quite misleading. Another program used average monthly enrollment--a much more meaningful statistic. In the case of the CIP, the enrollment count was the number of applicants who were admitted to the program--regardless of whether or not they ever attended. To make more valid comparisons among programs, it was necessary to probe records carefully and attempt to cast the enrollments of each program in a common metric. For the comparison sites and the CIP, enrollment was defined as the number of students assigned to the program minus those who never showed up for the program's instructional treatment.

The second point to be made regarding the validity of conclusions about enrollment is that only a few programs had reported enrollment goals or capacities. One program, for example, is operating at maximum capacity when serving 35 students per month. Thus, although it had enrolled fewer students than the other programs, it had enrolled as many as it could accommodate. For another program, maximum capacity was 90 students. While it was clear that programs cannot be expected to extend services beyond their maximum capacity, it also seemed unfair to make comparisons in terms of success in achieving enrollment quotas between large- and small-capacity programs. For the analysis, enrollment quotas of the various programs were not compared against each other. Rather the factors related to why the programs were or were not able to accomplish their enrollment objectives were discussed.

Attendance Rate Issues

Three factors made drawing conclusions about attendance rates hazardous. First, it is not clear whether the reported rates were based upon average daily attendance or some other estimates. For several CIP sites, the data reported represented the average attendance over a period of three months (March, April, and May 1979). Although the program's operations were more stable during this period than they were earlier, the figures are likely to be unrepresentatively low because the months of March, April, and May are generally the months in which attendance is poorest in most public schools.

A second factor related to attendance is the previous attendance patterns of the participating youths. Since one characteristic of the target population for these programs is poor attendance, consideration should have been given to previous attendance records and/or changes in attendance patterns from previous years. Only one comparison program reported such data.

A final factor related to attendance is the problem of attrition. In the case of several programs, it is clear that students who actually left the program were counted as absent rather than terminated.

Retention Rate

Different programs have used different formulas for measuring retention rates. One program, for example, took the total number of students enrolled at the time the calculation was made and divided it by the number of students initially enrolled. This procedure did not account for graduates and, as a result, a retention rate of 30% was reported. Had graduates been counted as retained, the rate would have been 55%. At another program, the retention rate was obtained by adding to the number of youths currently enrolled in the program those with "positive terminations" (e.g., graduating or returning to the regular school system) and dividing the sum by the total initial enrollment.

A second problem with retention rate data was the lack of consensus among programs over what is meant by positive and negative terminations. While a return to the regular high school would be regarded as a positive termination for one program, at another program such a termination would be considered negative.

Finally, there was a lack of consensus over the time and conditions under which a student was classified as having terminated. Most programs use the local LEA criteria for determining when a student's name should be removed from the enrollment list, but these criteria vary among the LEAs. In one program, the criterion for terminating a student was five consecutive days' absence, while in another, a student was considered terminated after four weeks' absence within a twelve-week period. Also, in some instances, students returned to the program just prior to being dropped from the enrollment list, or were dropped and then readmitted. Only one program reported the number of students dropped from the total enrollment who subsequently returned to the program. For these various reasons inferences regarding program features related to high retention rates were drawn quite cautiously.

Total Number of Graduates

It was considered inappropriate to make simple comparisons among programs in terms of the number of students "graduated." Programs differ from one another in terms of at least the following three highly relevant characteristics: (a) the kind of diploma offered, (b) the proportion of enrollees who were former dropouts as opposed to potential dropouts, and (c) the number of students who could meet graduation requirements in the time period being considered. It seemed almost certain, for example, that graduating students with GEDs is easier than graduating them with regular high school diplomas. It is also easier to graduate potential rather than actual dropouts and those who have completed most of the requirements for graduation as opposed to those who have completed fewer. When taken together, these factors were more than enough to explain all differences in graduation rates that were observed among programs. We were unable to identify any treatment variables that appeared to be related to graduation rates.

Summary

Assessing the advantages and disadvantages of the CIP in comparison to other alternative approaches is a complex and problematical task. Of five indicators of success, four--enrollment, attendance, retention, and number of graduates--had inconsistencies that rendered the drawing of conclusions extremely hazardous.

The major issues related to data comparability are summarized as follows:

- Enrollment Issues
    - Programs used different methods for estimating current and total enrollments (i.e., duplicated vs. unduplicated counts)
    - Enrollment capacity was confounded with total enrollment
- Attendance Rate Issues
    - Programs use different methods of calculating attendance rate
    - Programs use different procedures for recording attendance

- Retention Rate Issues
  - Programs used different methods of calculating retention rates
  - Programs differed in their definitions of negative and positive terminations

- Issues Related to Number of Graduates
  - Programs varied in the type of diploma offered to youths (i.e., GED vs. regular high school diploma)
  - Relationships existed between the number of graduates and the number of credits needed to graduate when youths entered the project. The programs that were compared served target groups that differed in this respect

In order to make useful comparisons among programs, some degree of comparability with respect to such concepts as "negative termination," "positive termination," "current enrollment," and "attendance" were essential. RMC was able to make some recalculations, but the desired degree of comparability could not be achieved from the information available in any existing records.

REFERENCES

A. Philip Randolph Skills Center. *Parent student handbook*. Philadelphia, PA: Author, 1980.

Dingle Associates, Inc. *Report on joint DHEW/DOL youth employment and demonstration project acts workshops*. Washington, D.C.: Author, 1978.

Enderlein, T. E. *Monograph on career education: A review of career education studies*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1976. [U.S. Office of Education Publication No. 017-080 D 1686-9]

Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. *National directory of experience-based career education*. San Francisco, CA: Author, 1978.

Gibboney Associates, Inc. *The Career Intern Program: Final report. Volume I: An experiment in career education that worked*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1977.

Glapion, G. *The Urban League Street Academy Progress Report 1977-78*. New Orleans, LA: Urban League, 1978. (a)

Glapion, G. *Quarterly Program Progress Report Emergency School Aid Act*. New Orleans, LA: Urban League, 1978. (b)

Glapion, G. *Urban League of Greater New Orleans Basic Skills Improvement Application*. New Orleans, LA: Urban League, 1979.

Mayor's Office of Manpower Resources. *Youthwork proposal*. Baltimore, MD: Author, 1978.

National Institute of Education. *Catalog of NIE products* (Volumes I & II). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1975.

National Institute of Education, Education and Work groups. *Program plan for fiscal year 1977-78*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1977.

National Institute of Education. *Request for proposal: Study of the Career Intern Program*. Washington, D.C.: Author, 1978. [RFP NIE-R-78-004]

New Orleans School District Division of Instruction and Child Advocacy. *Dropout report: 1977-78*. New Orleans, LA: Author, 1978.

Treadway, P. G., Stromquist, N. P., Fetterman, D. F., Foat, C. M., & Tallmadge, G. K. *Final Report - Task A: Implementation*. Mountain View, CA: RMC Research Corporation, 1981. [UR-478]

U.S. Government Printing Office. *Profiles of career education projects*. Washington, D.C.: Author, 1978.

Zuckerman, L. *Monongalia County Schools Alternative Learning Center: Condensed program report ending 31 October 1978*. Morgantown, WV: Monongalia County Board of Education, 1978. (a)

Zuckerman, L. *Monongalia County Schools Alternative Learning Center: 1977-78 yearly evaluation*. Morgantown, WV: Monongalia County Board of Education, 1978. (b)